Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 58 ST. LOUIS, MO. NOV. 1

"OUR REVOLUTIONARY RELIGION"

H. J. Hahn

Pastor of Salem Evangelical Church, 23 Calumet Place, Buffalo New York

For years I have found myself and my ministry in a sort of "No man's land" between two contending forces: the extreme revolutionists out there ahead of me and the army of Christian soldiery behind me. I have suffered the shell fire of both. When confronted by the revolutionists attacking religion as a vendor of opium, I have defended religion as an essentially revolutionary movement. When face to face with the church group vindictively waging war against the social radicals as anti-religionists, I contended that inferentially, if not actually, the radicals were religious in their blind faith that right must triumph against all odds. I sought to show that they were not as hopelessly antagonistic in principle as they assumed and that approachment and even a close alliance was not only possible but inevitable as a matter of consistency.

Both groups should find common ground in the premise or working hypothesis that behind this world life there is a force making for progress. That man is the measure of all things; the source of value is found in human desire, purpose and satisfaction. Progress then connotes the achieving of an increasing fullness, and satisfying abundance of life for man. This is the objective toward which the creative impulse of the world is straining. It is the objective toward which every human creature should bend his energies. *This procedure implies religion functioning as a revolutionary force.* As to the technique of revolution, as to whether it

should proceed through violence and bloodshed to paroxysmal change or through orderly educational parliamentary procedure, that is a highly controversial matter. Christianity is committed to the use of spiritual weapons, but the church has been known to resort to the strategy of armed force, to achieve moral progress and change. But revolutionary it must be. A forward looking religion lacking all revolutionary temper is a preposterous anomaly. Revolution, according to the dictionary definition is "extensive or radical change as in government, social or other conditions, relations, methods and ideas." And if religion aspires to a world-life better than the prevailing one, it must endure the discomfort, strain and annoyance of changing things, of becoming revolutionary.

Christianity is the world's religion to-day because it is by far the most revolutionary. Its vitality and vigor is retained in direct ratio to its pioneering mood, its readiness to push ahead to new moral and ethical frontiers. H. G. Wells pronounces the Kingdom teaching of Christianity "one of the most revolutionary doctrines that ever stirred and changed human thought."

Let us then trace this vital strain of revolutionary ferment through the pages of our religious history. At times we find it reduced to a thin red line, almost crowded out by priestcraft, ritual and institutionalism. Then again we come across pages that flame with revolutionary ardor and the demand for change.

First Wistful Yearning for Better Conditions

Where shall we begin. With the first parents brooding over, "paradise lost"? Already the aspiration to win it back by crushing the evil, symbolized by the serpent. Or with Noah commissioned to make a new beginning in society building? Or with Abraham revolting against moral decadence in Mesopotamia and launching a new social venture in Palestine? All faint beginnings, indicative of human yearning for better things, the germ of revolution.

Or shall we begin our search for the first spark of revolutionary religion in the Book of Exodus? Here there is no mistaking the rebel nature of religion. It is carried as a firebrand by Moses to arouse a whole race to revolt against the unbearable economic, industrial and political conditions. With divine sanction they broke their chains, death stalked in the streets of Egypt, and a great people took up their long march to freedom.

And then the laws of Moses! What demands of revolutionary changes they entailed: political, legal, economic. There were to be no kings, no landlords, no exploitation in this new land of promise.

The Cry of the Prophets

But the noble venture founded on the rocks of human frailty. Selfishness and acquisitiveness corrupted the pristine idealism. Kings arose, grasping and predatory; the equalitarian land laws became dead letters and landlords added field unto field until there was no room for the poor. For centuries the people groaned and agonized under oppression. Priestcraft in league with the exploiting hierarchy did its utmost to quench the fires of social aspirations. For long periods they succeeded in reducing it to a faintly smouldering spark. But periodically that spark would burst into flame in the utterances of some rugged, impetuous heroically reckless religious prophet who would invade the innermost courts of kings to read them the "riot act," strike terror to their hearts. Most revolts in Jewish history against tyranny were superinduced by religion, touched off by prophets of righteousness.

It is significant that Jesus later identified himself with the revolutionary line of prophets, not with the reactionary priesthood of Israel. What a challenging, stimulating, refreshing company of men those prophets were in that long dreary age of moral and ethical degradation and corruption. Persecuted, stoned, imprisoned, exiled by the beneficiaries of a rotten political system, yet they felt impelled of God to speak out for justice, for relief of human misery, to keep bright and untarnished the vision of a divine commonwealth where everyone should have his own vine and figtree and none to make them afraid; where strife and hostility should disappear and the lamb and lion would lie down together; where the orphan and widow, the most helpless and weak, would be cared for and enjoy utmost security. These men: Elijah, Elisha, Amos, Micah, Isaiah, hurled themselves with revolutionary ardor and passion against the oppression that blocked the social progress of their people, and their words have come down to us as the most inspiring literature of history.

The prophets were the radicals of that age, scorning the superficial, ineffective ceremonialism of the priest and calling the renegade nation to serve God by correcting the social sins of injustice and exploitation: "What does Jehovah require of them, but to do justice, and to love mercy." They centered their attack on profitable social sins, landlordism, usury, economic exploitation and political tyranny, quite as much as did the French, English, American or Russian revolutionists of a later day. Their hope, their aspirations? A Messiah shall appear, a Prince arise, Who would smash the forces that militate against human wellbeing and happiness; God's Kingdom would be established here on earth, a social order in which righteousness, peace, security and prosperity would be the

heritage of all. In the history of Utopian thought there is nothing more stirringly revolutionary than the acts and utterances of the Jewish prophets.

A "Social" Gospel

Coming then to the New Testament records, which after all constitute the blood, sinews and spirit of our religion, we are on even surer ground, for the contention that ours is a revolutionary religion. Even before the days of the rediscovered Social Gospel intelligent reading of the Gospels filled the hearts of men with grim forebodings as to the far-reaching, disturbing, revolutionary implications of Jesus' program. Says James Russell Lowell: "There is dynamite enough in the New Testament, if illegitimately applied, to blow all our existing institutions to atoms." Emile de Lavelaye, Belgian economist of the last century arrives at the same conclusion: "If Christianity were taught and understood conformable to the spirit of its Founder, the existing social organism could not last a day."

Let us briefly consider the historic economic setting of the Christian movement, take a hurried glimpse into the home-life of Jesus and then review a few of His most outstanding pronouncements and teachings.

Economic Background

The writers of Scripture tell us that in the "fullness of time," God sent the Messiah. The modern revolutionist, explaining events by "economic determinism" arrives at the same conclusion, that back there in the first century of our era the time was ripe for the rise of a revolutionary movement. The Roman Empire 1900 years ago was at the height of its cruel glory. Unabashed imperialism was its frank policy. The Roman legions had marched forth to beat into subjugation every people in the known world. These legions were stationed in every land to collect tribute with which to satiate the perverted appetites of the Roman ruling class.

Palestine was also being ground under the iron heel of imperial Rome. This province was not only being taxed to death by the foreign invader, but the Jewish proletariat was likewise being bled white by unconscionable exploitation at the hand of native landowners, profiteering merchants and a grasping priest hierarchy. The common people were in bad shape. Endlessly they toiled only to have the fruits of their labor appropriated by rich "fools," "foxy" Herods and unscrupulous priests. The Bible record presents a picture of a land overrun with beggars, the hungry, sick, blind, helpless, while the ruling class flaunted their luxury and extravagance before their eyes.

In such soil discontent thrives. The Jews with their heritage

of pronouncedly revolutionary strain, did not take this oppression docilely. We have already pointed out that their greatest prophets and leaders had been rebels. It was to be expected then that throughout Palestine there were rumblings of revolt and erratic uprisings quickly and brutally suppressed by Roman soldiery.

The Galilean Carpenter

The most hot-headed, inflammatory group in Palestine were the Galilean peasants and shepherds of Northern Palestine. They nursed a deepseated, bitter grudge against the proud aristocracy of Jerusalem. It is a matter of historic record that whenever the Galileans made a pilgrimage to the capital city, a few extra regiments of Roman soldiers had to be called out to keep order.

Jesus, was a Galilean. His father was an exploited carpenter. His mother, Mary, was a flaming revolutionist, a Joan of Arc, inspired with the idea that, if ever she became the mother of a son, that son would be dedicated to the task of liberating the oppressed. When she felt that time approaching she cries out exultingly:

> "He hath routed the proud-minded.
> He has dethroned monarchs and exalted the poor
> He has satisfied the hungry with good things
> and sent the rich away empty-handed."

It would be difficult to find in the whole field of literature a pasage more revolutionary than the Magnificat.

If the Behaviourists are right, then Jesus was properly conditioned before and after birth to be an inspired revolutionist, undertaking the task of discrediting and overthrowing the old Mammonistic order and establishing the new Kingdom. As a youth He associated with rebels. On every street corner He heard the fiery, denunciatory language of the mal-contents. His only literature was the prophetic literature, teeming with woes against those who add house to house and field to field until there is no room for the poor. His near relative was John the Baptist, the outstanding radical of that day whose vitriolic condemnation of acquisitive society caused him to be beheaded by a cautious Roman governor. Considering all this, it is not surprising that Jesus grown to manhood should go forth on the declared mission of organizing the common people into a movement for the establishment of a new order of human life. Jesus referred to this new social arrangement as God's Kingdom of righteousness.

The Revolutionary Ring in Jesus' Teachings

There are certain fundamental concepts that are common to all social radicals of the past and present. Among them the following are perhaps in the forefront: Internationalism, opposition

to exploitation or the profit system, public ownership and control, the theory of class struggle and bitter criticism of religion. Now if we turn to the teachings of Jesus, we can find practically all these ideas incorporated there.

Internationalism: Over against Roman imperialism and Jewish nationalism, Jesus urged world brotherhood or internationalism. He insisted, as dogmatically as any Communist, that all racial and national lines must be wiped out; that His people must regard as comrades and brothers, the white, the black, the red and the yellow—the Samaritan, Syrian, Ethiopian, all. No followers of His were ever to bear arms in international conflict.

Exploitation: Jesus was the implacable foe of exploitation, the system by which men are used by other men for their own enrichment. According to Jesus the man who used men to fill ever more barns with surplus was a "rich fool." The man who revelled in luxury at the expense of a starving Lazarus courted the dangers of hell. "Woe unto you that devour widow's houses." He had naught but contempt for those who "lorded it over" their subjects. He insisted that in the new social order, service rendered to society would be the only criterion of greatness.

Common Ownership: He utterly rejected private ownership because it stimulated greed and predatory selfishness, these disintegrating, disrupting forces in society. A house divided against itself (the "haves" against the "have-nots") cannot stand. "Do not store up riches," He warns. He visualizes a society, as do the modern Socialists, in which food, clothing and shelter will come to all as naturally as it does to the birds of the air or the lilies of the field. Give men economic security, and you remove the cause and justification for this insane, mad scramble for private possession. It was Jesus' teaching about property that actuated the early Christians to experiment with simon-pure communism—"they had all things in common."

Class Struggle: Condemnation is frequently heaped upon the radicals of our day on the score that their's is an appeal to one class, the working class; that thereby class hatred is fomented. Their answer is that social peace and harmony is impossible until all classes are merged into one. Jesus seems to have felt that way about it likewise. He addressed himself to the working class: "I am come to preach deliverance to the poor." His gospel was characterized as "good news for the poor." The common people heard Him gladly. According to the story of the rich young ruler, Jesus received rich men into his group only on the condition that they ceased being rich through ridding themselves of their wealth. "Where your treasure is, there is your heart also." "You cannot serve God and Mammon"—society and vested rights.

Anti-Religious: By the bigoted, sociallyblind religionists of His day Jesus also was regarded as an enemy of religion, a blasphemer of God. It appeared so because His condemnation of the rigidly ritualistic religion of the Pharisees, devoid of all human compassion was harsh and ruthless. "The scribes and Pharisees have taken Moses' seat—they talk but do not act. They tie up heavy loads and have them put on men's shoulders, but they will not lift a finger to move them—Woe unto you, you hypocritical scribes and Pharisees for you pay tithes on mint, dill and cummin, and you have let the weightier matter of the Law go—justice, mercy and integrity. You blind guides! straining out the gnat, and yet swallowing the camel. Etc., etc." Matt. 23.

The Early Church

Up to the 4th Century the Christian Church maintained its revolutionary character — an outlaw organization — hunted down with a severity unequaled in history. But it would not yield to force. Then under Constantine, the Roman Empire learned a new trick. Instead of force and intimidation, it tried bribery, blandishment and flattery. They subsidized the Christian church; made it the state religion. They wrested the property from the old pagan religious groups, their temples and treasures, and turned it over to the Christian church. They flattered and patronized the leaders in the church, the bishops and archdeacons, showed them favors and preferments and tied them securely to their chariot wheels. And lo, the church became respectable, conservative and regular. The great writers of the church and preachers, living in the luxuriant atmosphere of the rich and powerful, began to explain away the hard sayings of Jesus and to tone them down. They built up a justification for private property, landlordism and interest and urged upon men a meek submission to injustice as a means of attaining the rewards of heaven beyond.

Primitive Communism in the Middle Ages

But in spite of the fact that the church as an institution capitulated and, instead of championing the cause of the oppressed, turned to resist them in behalf of the ruling class that fed and financed a corrupt priesthood, nevertheless the revolutionary spirit of primitive Christianity would not down. In his books "The Social Struggles in the Middle Ages" and "Socialist Forerunners," M. Beer, a radical writer, traces the rise of modern revolutionary movements. As one reads this treatise, it strikes one as a chapter from church history, so constantly does Christian sentiment and religion permeate it all as a powerful ferment and incentive to

social unrest and aspiration. Beer says: "The heroic struggle for Communism and social justice was nourished by religious forces." "Christian ideology powerfully influenced all conceptions of social life." "Medieval Communism may theoretically be traced back to the traditions of primitive Christianity."

Of course, I do not mean to imply that the established church espoused the cause of primitive Christian communism. It did not. In fact it was bitterly anti-communistic, a defender of private property. But out of the ranks of the church there flowed a continual stream of non-conformists, dissenters, who had caught the ideal of primitive Christian socialism and raised the torch of liberation. *They were born of the church even though the church disowned them.*

They became monks living in communistic settlements or heretics. Both groups nurtured the love of human freedom and stirred up the masses against autocracy, actuated by Christian motives. Throughout the Middle Ages this was practically the only source of radical social thought and action. Churchmen carried on the struggle for human liberty. Practically every heresy which was hunted out and persecuted was based on Christian communism and almost every monastic order set out with the idea of repudiating private property and living a communal life. The Benedictine and Franciscan orders were out and out Communistic, until they were curbed and subsidized. They produced such outstanding champions of social and scientific progress as Duns Scotus, William Ockham and Sir Roger Bacon. These men and hundreds like them were influenced by the philosophy of early Christianity. Only gradually these monastic orders became secularized and tamed.

Revolutionary Religious Sects

With the beginning of the 12th Century all of Western and Central Europe was honeycombed with religious sects, whose aim was to establish their ethical, social, economic life on a primitive Christian basis. They were known as the Cathari. They inspired various armed revolts of the peasants against feudalism, as for instance in Bulgaria. Another sect was the "Waldensians," who regarded private property as evil and supported communism. Dollinger, a learned historian, who had made a thorough study of all these various sects, declares that all of them "which arose in the Middle Ages had explicitly or implicitly a revolutionary character and threatened to dissolve the existing political order and effect social transformation.—They had to be put down in a series of bloody struggles.—They were the Socialists and Communists of their time."

In Bosnia these religious radicals captured the government and held out until they were crushed by a "white" army, the Hungarian-Polish crusade, in a grim struggle, in which 60,000 perished. In Italy, France, England, everywhere the equalitarian, social, ethical teachings of Jesus were appealed to in opposing autocracy and exploitation.

Commencing with the 14th century peasant uprisings and wars were the order of the day. Certain groups were taking advantage of the hard times and misery of the people to show them the wrongness, the maladjustments of the old system of things and to lead them to try something better. M. Beer tells us that the seat of this revolutionary agitation was Oxford University "whence" says he, "the poor priests and heretical theologians propagated their doctrines to the 'open fields' or peasant communes." He says: "There is no doubt that the underlying ideas of the agitators' speeches were taken from the social ethics of primitive Christianity and the Church Fathers."

We haven't time to go into all the historic phases of this movement. Our purpose is merely to indicate the very large and leading part taken by early Christian, religious thought in the social struggles almost down to our own age. In conclusion let us just make mention of John Wycliffe. Not only did he get into difficulties for advocating Communism but he translated the Bible into the popular tongue and as H. G. Wells declares, the printed Bible loosed floods of Communist sentiment. Then there is that dramatic figure, John Ball, known as the "Mad Priest of Kent," who with his inflammatory speeches helped to kindle the English Peasant Revolt. That he drew his inspiration from the Bible is indicated by that bit of rhyme that comes down to us from his campaigning:

> "When Adam ploughed and Eve span
> Where was then the gentleman?"

John Hus, too, deserves mention here. Under his leadership Bohemia was up in arms against autocracy. The Taborite movement, so widespread among the workers, is placed in parallel with the Russian Revolution 500 years later. Historians declare it was the center of social and communistic aspirations of Europe; and in Germany during the 16th century, it was the religious, "back-to-the-Bible" movement that loosed the Peasant Wars there.

In short, I refer just sketchily to all these men and movements to indicate that the fundamental philosophy of our religion has proven to be of an extremely revolutionary character—a veritable leaven generating a consistent social ferment—even when the re-

actionary forces within the church frowned upon and persecuted the revolutionary movements. The church let it loose inadvertently. The social struggles of the Old Testament days were inspired by the spirit of the ancient prophets, the struggles of the Christian era can be traced directly to the influence of the Man crucified on Calvary, the Man Whom the church accepts as its inspired Leader.

If then the church in the past indirectly, even against its conscious will, loosed such social, democratic ferment by virtue of its fundamental principles, it is interesting to speculate what would happen if the powerful, influential church of today, as an organization, could be forced by logic and the trend of social events to seriously undertake the realization of its espoused program of "God's Kingdom come on earth as it is in Heaven."

Dear Friend:

This is the last number of the Theological Magazine in 1930. If you have been a reader of it before, we trust we can count on you in 1931. If you have not been a reader, we are sending this issue to you so as to get you to give us a trial in the coming year.

There are quite a few among us who don't expect much from our own theological periodical. They take it for granted that the Evangelical Synod, with one or two exceptions, hasn't produced any men whose writings are worth knowing. They reflect the attitude of those otherwise well-meaning men who, in the time of Jesus of Nazareth, tried to justify their skepticism by saying, "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?"

To these we say, with Philip of Bethsaida, "Come and see!"

Nathaniel did come and was soon convinced. You come to us and give us a year's chance. We can't promise you that you will see the heaven open and the angels of God ascending and descending. But we believe that what you get at our table will be just as good, if not better, than the crumbs you pick up from the tables of the strangers.

Very fraternally yours,

H. Kamphausen, D.D., Editor.

THE ORIGIN OF LIFE

H. J. Schick

Past and Present Theories

It will be of great assistance to us if before we take up the speculations regarding the origin of life, we first endeavor to define the meaning of life. Life has no adequate definition. Whether we define it as did Aristotle as "the sum of the functions that resist death"[1] or as Bechat who defined it as "the assemblage of the operation of nutrition, growth, and destruction,"[2] we still find that the definition is far from satisfactory. H. H. Newman, a professor of the University of Chicago, says that we may be aided in defining life by contrasting it with the lifeless. He then proceeds to give what he believes are the main differences between living and lifeless matter. Some of these differences are the method of growth, reproduction, metabolism, and adaptability.[3]

L. L. Woodruff has said that "life is so complex that it can not be described concisely and so unique that it is impossible to resort to the lexicographer's trick of comparing it with something else."[4]

From the earliest time, the origin of life offered an interesting subject for speculation. How far back these speculations went in the history of the human race is not known. We find among the Greeks, however, that Thales believed the ocean to be the parent of all life.[5] Anaximines, on the other hand, believed that the air gave life to all.[6] Aristotle's belief, however, was the one which gained almost universal acceptance. He believed that sometimes animals are formed in putrefying soil, sometimes in plants and sometimes in the fluids of other animals.[7] This theory seemed borne out by the every day experience of man. It gained such general recognition that it became known as the theory of spontaneous generation or abiogenesis. Thus we find that Virgil gives us a specific method for obtaining bees from bullocks. His method is of such interest that we shall quote his words here. "First a space of ground of small dimensions is chosen; this they cover with the tiling of a narrow roof and with confining walls, and add four openings with a slanting light turned toward the four points of the compass. Then a bullock, just arching his horns upon the forehead of two years old, is sought out; whilst he struggles fiercely, they close up both his nostrils and his mouth; and when they have

[1] *The Evolution of the Earth* (Yale: University Press, 1919) p. 86.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 86.
[3] *Outline of General Zoology* (Chicago: University Press, 1920) p. 40.
[4] Woodruff, *Evolution of Earth* (Yale: University Press, 1919) p. 86.
[5] Newman, H. H., *Outlines of General Zoology* (Chicago: University Press, 1920) p. 40.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 40.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

beaten him to death, his battered carcass is macerated within the hide which remains unbroken. Then they leave him in the pent-up chamber, and lay under his sides fragments of boughs, thyme, and fresh cassia. This is done when the first zephyrs stir the waves, before the meadows blush with new colors, before the twittering swallow suspends her nest upon the rafters. Meanwhile, the animal juices, warmed in the softened bones, ferment, and living things of wonderful aspect, first devoid of feet and in a little while buzzing with wings, and more and more take to the thin air till they burst away like a shower poured down from summer clouds."[8] While this account is undoubtedly poetic, it certainly is not scientific. In the sixteenth century, Van Helmont, a famous chemist and physicist, describes a method for engendering mice by putting some dirty linen into a receptacle together with some grains of wheat or a piece of cheese.[9] While we are apt to criticize our ancestors for lack of careful observation, we must and should keep in mind that in rural communities the idea of spontaneous generation still lingers. H. H. Newman points out that in rural communities the idea is rather generally believed that frogs come down in rain and that mosquitoes arise spontaneously in stagnant water. He says further that "all of us have heard that a black horsehair, if left in a watering trough will transform itself into a wriggling thread worm."[10] In 1680, however, Redi proved that by putting fine gauze over decaying meat that no maggots developed in the meat as was generally believed to be the case. Redi noted that flies laid their eggs on the gauze and that these eggs developed into maggots.[11] This experiment was so conclusive that it generally broke down the belief in spontaneous generation. In the opinion of L. L. Woodruff that such ideas of the origin of life were prevalent and their truth untested, before Redi's experiment, is an eloquent commentary on the general state of the scientific method before the Renaissance.[12]

Not more than three years later, however, the belief "took a new lease on life." Strangely enough, one of the greatest scientific discoveries of all time was responsible for its revival. The newly invented microscope disclosed bacteria for the first time. Bacteria were so small and simple that it was not believed impossible that they were generated spontaneously. Various experiments seemed to substantiate this point of view. Thus, fluids which were found

---

Press, 1920) p. 41.

[9]Newman, H. H., *Outlines of General Zoology* (Chicago: University Press, 1920) p. 41.

[10]*Ibid.*, p. 42.

[11]Schaefer, A. E., *Life: Its nature, Origin* (London: Longman's Green Co., 1912) p. 20.

[12]*Evolution of the Earth* (Yale: University Press, 1919) p. 86.

[8]Newman, H. H., *Outlines of General Zoology* (Chicago: University

to be free from bacteria after being exposed to the air a short time were found to contain these microscopic organisms.[13] It was not until Pasteur proved that these organisms were not spontaneously generated in the fluids but were carried in from the air[14] that the idea lost ground. Tyndall and Cohn later verified these experiments of Pasteur. They proved that when fluids were boiled to kill off existing bacteria and then the fluids sealed up so as to prevent the entrance of other bacteria from the air, no bacteria developed in the infusion.[15]

Thus the old idea of spontaneous generation died. "It is now regarded as one of the best established laws of life that all life comes from pre-existing life. That however life may have originated it is certain that at the present time all life comes from pre-existing life."[16] Omne vivum ex vivo.

It may be added here that in recent times there has been only one scientist, the late Dr. Charlton Bastian, who still adhered to the old idea. Dr. A. E. Schaefer while he regards Dr. Bastian as "an eminent scientist" says that nevertheless, if life appears in flasks containing hermetically sealed fluids which have been boiled the explanation is that either there has been a fallacy in carrying out the operation or else the organisms have resisted the heat.[17]

Other scientists in attempting to explain the results of Dr. Bastian, who claims to have seen the origin of bacteria in infusions which, he claimed, had been heated to a point that must have killed all life and which were afterwards kept sealed, say that his results are due to complex chemical reactions such as vortex motion which gives rise to matter which simulates living organisms.[18]

Modern speculation as to the origin of life is divided into three camps. The vitalists who believe that life was created by a supernatural power and, therefore, never will be explained through the medium of Physics and Chemistry. The Mechanists who believe that when a final analysis is made there will be a perfect series between the inorganic and the organic world. They further believe that life is merely a chemical and physical phenomenon. Last, there is a growing group which believes that while life may ultimately be explained through physics and chemistry, yet there is a supernatural power guiding these natural forces.[19]

---

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 86.
[14] Pasteur, L., *Studies on Fermentation* (Paris: 1879) p. 48.
[15] Woodruff, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
[16] *Science*, vol. 21 (1905) p. 1080.
[17] *Life: Its Nature, Origin and Maintenance* (London: Longmans Green & Co., 1912) p. 14.
[18] *Lancet*, vol. 197 (1919) p. 175.
[19] Newman, H. H., *Outlines of General Zoology* (Chicago: University Press, 1920).

No modern biologist subscribes to vitalism although some have come to see the third point of view.[20] Biologists object to Vitalism on the ground that it is negation of the scientific method and at once removes the problem from the realm of scientific investigation.[21] Biologists naturally object to any theory which removes the problem from their hands. All biologists at the present time will admit that we are utterly unable to give an adequate explanation of the fundamental life processes in terms of physics and chemistry.[22] Dr. Woodruff further says that the twentieth century finds relatively few representative scientists who really expect a scientific explanation of life ever to be attained or who expect that protoplasm will ever be artificially synthesized.[23] Dr. E. B. Wilson, the dean of biologists, has said that the study of the cell has tended to widen rather than to narrow the enormous gap which separates even the lowest forms of life from the inorganic world.[24]

We may sum up the biologist's position, then, by saying that while the biologist firmly believes that life can be described, or defined by natural laws operating about us he does not expect life itself ever to be explained. The more he studies the question, the farther from the explanation he seems to be. Thus we see that the vitalist can never be dislodged from his position, in fact, he may, according to biologists, be correct. Dr. Newman speaking on this point quotes a prominent zoologist "that the mechanistic hypothesis of living things is not fully established, it may not be adequate or even true; yet I can only believe that until every other possibility has been exhausted, scientific biologists should hold fast to mechanism."[25]

This is the spirit of modern biologists and it is in this spirit that the following mechanistic theories were proposed. Mr. Woodruff says that "in justice to the authors of the various theories it may be said that the theories are not advanced as final solutions of the origin of life, but rather as gropings toward the formulation of the conditions which might have attended and contributed to its genesis."[26]

Perhaps the best known of all the mechanistic theories is the Cosmozoa theory. This theory, which had great vogue a number of years ago, was propounded by Sir William Thomson in his presidential address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1871. It simply states that life was carried in from another planet or star in the crevices of a meteorite. The Cos-

[20] Woodruff, L. L., *op. cit.*, p. 95.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 96.
[22] Woodruff, L. L., *op. cit.*, p. 96.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 96.
[24] *The Problem of Development* (New York: Appleton & Co., 1905) p. 271.
[25] *Outlines of General Zoology* (Chicago: University Press, 1920) p. 47.
[26] *Evolution of Earth* (Yale: University Press, 1919) p. 95.

mozoa theory depends on two assumptions—that life exists elsewhere in the universe and that life can be maintained during the interstellar voyage.[27] "The apparently fatal objection was raised that it would take some sixty million years for a meteorite to travel from the nearest stellar system to our earth, and it is inconceivable that life could be maintained during such a period of time. Even from the nearest planet one hundred and fifty years would be necessary. The temperature of space is two hundred and seventy-three degrees below zero Centigrade. Furthermore, the heating of the meteorite in passing through our atmosphere and its impact with the earth would, in all probability, destroy any life which might have existed within it."[28]

It has been pointed out, however, that certain types of bacteria can successfully endure a temperature of nearly two hundred degrees below zero Centigrade for six months, and lower temperatures for shorter periods. They can also withstand temperatures as high as one hundred and twenty degrees Centigrade for a short time. Spores of bacteria are known to keep their vitality over a period of fifty years and there is no reason for assuming we have found the most resistant bacteria.[29] It is, threfore, believed possible by many scientists that life could be transported in the way suggested.

A variation of the Cosmozoa theory was suggested by the renowned chemist Auhenius. He has suggested that the radiation pressure of light is sufficient to overcome the attraction of gravitation for living particles of great minuteness and that some germs might make the journey to the earth on bits of cosmic dust without undergoing the heating which is experienced by a meteorite. Auhenius states that if germs were carried through space in this manner it would take only nine thousand years from the nearest stellar system and only twenty days from Mars.[30] It is apparent that the theory can neither be proved or disproved.[31] "The Cosmozoa theory does not answer the question. It simply removes its origin to a conveniently inaccessible corner of the universe where its solution is impossible."[32]

Dr. Schaefer believes "that it is not courageous to put off the problem of life's origin into cosmic space instead of resolutely seeking it within the forces and elements of our own planet." And again, "Knowing what we know and believing what we believe as to the part plăyed by evolution in the development of terrestrial matter, we are, without denying the possibility of life in other parts

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 96.
[28] *Popular Science Monthly*, vol. 70 (1909). Pp. 280-285.
[29] Woodruff, *op. cit.*, p. 97.
[30] *Worlds in the Making* (Chap. VIII, 1908) p. 221.
[31] *Scientific Monthly*, vol. XIX, pp. 175-177.
[32] Woodruff, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

of the universe, justified in regarding these cosmic theories as inherently improbable."[33]

Let us now turn our attention to one of the more favorably looked upon theories, namely, Pflügers theory. Pflüger starts with the assumption that the earth was once in a highly heated incandescent condition. He believes that the proteins are the most characteristic componnds in the protoplasm. He states that the difference between a living and a dead protein is a combination of carbon and nitrogen which is known as the cyanogen or CN radical. Add this cyanogen radical to a bit of protoplasm and it is equivalent to adding life. This cyanogen radical takes up a great deal of heat when it forms and is, therefore, a source of great energy for the proteins. The question before us is "How did the cyanogen arise?" Pflüger says that "Nothing is clearer than the possibility of the formation of cyanogen compounds when the earth was wholly or partially in a fiery or heated state."[34] This implies the origin of life out of fire. Once the cyanogen radical had formed and when the temperature was sufficiently low to permit the precipitation of water this with salts and gases in solution joined the growing cyanogen complex and gave rise to proteins. Thus arose a relatively simple homogeneous material from which evolved the protoplasmic masses or cells of organic life today. An interesting side-light on this theory is that Pflüger believes that a cyanogen compound called cyanic acid displays qualities which he believes show it to be half alive.

Directly opposite to Pflüger's theory that life arose from heat is Moore's idea that life arose from cooling. Moore says that as the earth began to cool, various kinds of chemical compounds began to appear. First, came the most stable and the most simple, and finally came the most complex and unstable. Moore believes strongly in what he terms the "law of complexity." He says, "This note can not be too strongly sounded that as matter is allowed capacity for assuming complex forms those complex forms appear.[35] Atoms, molecules, colloids and living organisms arise as a result of the operating of the "law of complexity." He goes on to say that as soon as oxides can be there, oxides appear; when the temperature admits of carbonates, then carbonates are forthwith formed. Next in order of development, prior to life, the inorganic colloids appear in the waters of the cooling globe. Finally came many kinds of organic colloids which united in various proportions to form colloidal aggregates. Organic colloids are characterized by their highly complex molecular structure, their instability, their slowness of reaction, and their sensitivity.

[33]Schaefer, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
[34]Woodruff, *op. cit.*, p. 99.
[35]Moore, B., *The Origin and Nature of Life* (New York: H. Holt & Co., 1913).

Some of these colloidal aggregates become organized into the first cells which among other qualities had the ability to reproduce. From this point evolution steps in.[36]

We have seen that both Pflüger's and Moore's theories have postulated a heated earth. This is in accordance with Laplace's Nebular Hypothesis of the origin of the earth. The Nebular Hypothesis states that the earth arose from a hot, gaseous, rotating nebula. Many scientists have now turned to the Planetesimal Hypothesis of Chamberlin and Moulton in which it is stated that the earth never was in a heated condition and that temperature has always been as it is today. In accordance with this theory we have Allen's theory of the origin of life.[37] Allen believes that the conditions which support life are also favorable for its origin. He says that life arose at a period when the physical conditions of the earth came to be nearly what they are today.[38] Discharges of lightning in the damp air produced ammonia and oxides of nitrogen. Gradually large amounts of these substances accumulated in the land waters. The water also contained metals and carbon dioxide. Thus in the land waters all the materials necessary for life were present. The heat of the sun acting on these raw materials caused atomic rearrangement. In this way compounds of nitrogen, carbon, etc. accumulated in the waters of the damp earth and further reaction occurred among them. Gradually substances were built up which began to have the aspects of living matter. These substances at first simply traded energy with each other. After an enormous lapse of time these diffuse substances gradually changed into cellular masses.[39]

But why does not new life come into existence if the conditions now are favorable for its origin? Dr. Allen believes that bacteria would eat all new life as fast as it were formed. He says, however, that were life completely wiped out, a new cycle would begin.[40]

In recent years we are hearing more and more of enzymes and the part they play in the life functions. An enzyme may be defined as an unorganized or chemical compound of vegetable or animal origin that causes chemical transformation such as hydrolysis, oxidation, coagulation, synthesis, reduction, etc. An enzyme is produced by an animal or vegetable cell. Its function is not definitely understood, but it is apparently a catalyst which has the ability of hastening a chemical reaction without undergoing any change itself. The enzyme is so important that it is small wonder

[36] Moore, B., *op. cit.*, p. 100.
[37] Allen, F. S., *What Is Life?* (Nat. Hist. Soc., 1899) p. 44.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 45.
[39] Allen, F. S., *op. cit.*, p. 45.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

that we should have a theory of the origin of life based upon them. This theory[41] states that a small portion of autocatalytic enzyme appeared in the ocean waters and reacted with the substances present to form an oily liquid. The enzyme gradually became enveloped in the oily liquid and continued to react thus causing the oil drop to increase in size until it split in two. Thus, continues the theory, arose the first and simplest life-substance, possessing the power of indefinitely continued growth by virtue of the enzyme. The only objection which can be raised, say the adherents of this theory, is the fortuitous formation of the original enzyme. But, they insist, since only a molecule is needed we can easily imagine this being formed.

The last theory which I shall present is Osborn's theory.[42] Osborn says that the earth, air and water contain all the chemical elements necessary for life. These elements were combined at temperatures of between six and eighty-seven degrees Centigrade. An initial step in the origin of life was the coordination or bringing together of these elements which so far as we know had never been combined before. These elements were bound by a new electrical attraction while they were in a state of colloidal suspension, for it is in this state best suited for actions and reactions. Enzymes arose along with these new substances. Gradually these substances changed into organisms and were characterized by the fact that rudiments of competition and selection arose among them.

These theories do not, of course, cover the entire field of mechanistic speculation. They merely point in the direction to which scientific minds are turning. We have seen that these theories all differ greatly and that there is much generalization and guess work within them. However, the biologists assert, that there is no reason for assuming that life could not have originated by these methods, for, as Dr. Schaefer says, "we know that the inorganic materials of the world are continually undergoing changes. New chemical combinations are constantly being formed and old ones broken up; new elements are making their appearance and old ones disappearing."[43] "Well may we ask ourselves," says Dr. Schaefer, "why the production of living matter alone should be subject to other laws than those which have produced and are producing, the various forms of non-living matter."

"Over against these various theories as to the origin of life, we have the simple, yet sublime statement of the Holy Scriptures that life originates in God. In the very first words of the Bible the emphasis is put upon God. It is God who creates the heavens

[41] Troland, L. T., *Chemical Origin of Life* (Monist, vol. 24, 1914).
[42] *Scientific Monthly*, vol. 3 (1916) p. 5.
[43] *Scientific Monthly*, vol. 3 (1916) p. 6.

and the earth. It is God who causes the planets to appear upon the earth. It is God who creates the water animals, the birds, and the land animals. It is God who by a special act creates man. Everywhere and throughout the story of creation the word God appears. God is the great force, the directing wisdom and power back of it all. And apart from God creation cannot be understood and becomes meaningless.

Eden Publishing House,

St. Louis, Mo.

Kindly enter my subscription for 1931 to the six issues of the

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

Signed .....

Address .....

Subscription Price:

Theological Magazine $2.00

Combination, two publications:

Theol. Magazine with Friedensbote *or* Herald $3.00

Combination, three publications:

Theol. Magazine with Friedensbote *and* Herald $4.50

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE BARTHIAN MOVEMENT OR THE THEOLOGY OF CRISIS

By Rev. A. J. Munsterman, B.D.
Pastor of St. John's Evangelical Church, Evanston, Illinois

Soon after the war a book appeared that was widely discussed, pro and con, namely: Spengler's, "The Decline of the West." Spengler as an historian, saw the decline or collapse of a definite culture. About the same time there appeared another seer, Karl Barth, who read the sign of the times as a world crisis in theology. Spengler's and Barth's philosophy and history are variant, but both are prophetic voices.

The Barthian movement takes its name from Karl Barth, born in Basel in 1886. He studied in Marburg, Tuebingen and Berlin. At the end of his University work, he took over a church at Aargau, north of Lucerne, Switzerland. This was a German Protestant church made up of peasants. Aargau was near the war zone in Alsace. Here he studied, dreamed and wrote. In the fall of 1918 there appeared his first book, a commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. It is in reality a series of short sermons or expositions upon the verses, taken in order. When we read it we are somewhat puzzled. We have never seen such a commentary before. There is an absence of all literary and historical material that commentators are in the habit of furnishing. The book lacks sequence, and one becomes exasperated with the task of trying to enjoy or understand his message. No doubt interested readers of German theology gave up trying to understand the Barthian movement after reading parts of the "Roemerbrief." This is to be regretted.

Upon the publication of this book, he was called to Goettingen. Here he remained four years. He is now teaching to crowded class rooms at Muenster in Westphalia. Bixler describes him at a conference with students in his home, thus: "From the way he conducted himself during the evening, it was not difficult to see why he is considered the leader of the movement. He is a most vigorous and energetic personality, the type which we call "dynamic," exceedingly intent upon the matter in hand, ready to listen, yet quick to emphasize his own point, winning the interest of others because of his own confidence in the power of his ideas, not at all a domineering mind, but certainly a dominant one."

Barth's books and writings became the foundation of a new theology. Barth at once found other theologians rallying to his cause. Edward Thurneysen studied at Marburg and Heidelberg,

and is now a Pastor in Basel. He has more of a quiet reserved nature than Barth. He is collaborator with Barth in much of his work. The outstanding collaboration is an excellent volume of sermons: "Suchet Gott, so werdet ihr leben." Friederich Gogarten, who studied at Heidelberg, is now teaching at Jena. He writes in a dogmatic strain like Barth.

Friederich Gogarten echoes Barth's plea for a return to the rugged and independent faith of the reformers and prophesies death for the Protestant church if it continues to treat theology as a branch of the history of philosophy, to concern itself with ethical movements as if they were of truly religious significance, or to regard the aesthetic experience as if it were allied to religion. Religion and the church must return to God, their author and founder. Gogarten differs from Barth chiefly in making a Lutheran emphasis where Barth is strongly Calvinistic.

Bultmann of Marburg, another exponent of the movement, has developed similar ideas while working in the field of New Testament criticism. His use of the word, "Entscheidung," that is, "Decision" or "Crisis," has given its name to the whole group. For Bultmann the crisis comes when a man is confronted by the teachings of Jesus and realizes their import for life. By them he is brought face to face with the significance of the kingdom of God. Complete renunciation and complete obedience are then demanded of him.

Besides Barth, the best known in America is H. Emil Brunner. He was a Swiss Fellow of Union Theological Seminary in New York, 1919-20. His special field is systematic theology. In the fall of 1928 he made a tour through the eastern part of America, lecturing at schools and seminaries. These lectures were published under the title of, "The Theology of Crisis." This book is by far the best, and more understandable to me than any other. Other leaders in the Barthian or Crisis movement are Knittermeyer and Heinrich Barth.

The Swiss and German theological reviews were full of articles debating the value and significance of this new theology. Dr. Keller calls it, "the most remarkable theological phenomenon on the Continent since the theology of Ritschl." Count Keyserling called Barth, "the man who saved Protestantism in Germany." Harnack broke his silence of years and wrote a series of articles against the new movement. Troeltsch, before his death, and Prof. Juelicher, treated Barth with seriousness and apprehension. Prof. Lange, who is known for his researches in reformation and post-reformation history, calls Barth the "greatest man since Schleiermacher." Friends have been won among the Roman Catholic

writers. In general, it was well received by the Lutherans and Calvinists. In fact, it was better received than anything else produced by Protestantism since the Reformation. The reason for this will be seen later. The strange thing is that the Barthian movement found the readiest acceptance with the conservatives, although he had originally belonged to the liberal school, Prof. W. Hermann of Marburg being his revered teacher.

In America Barth is little known, and those who know him do not know what to make of him. Prof. Knudson calls him "the German fundamentalist," which explains little, and is only true in part. The Barthian school accepts the results of Biblical criticism and has no magical conceptions of revelation. Neither has it any quarrel with physical sciences and evolution. It tends to escape the relativity of thought through dogmatism. It is a new kind of fundamentalism, or rather an old kind of orthodoxy. It is a revival of the theology of the Reformation, Calvinistic in its conception of God, and Lutheran in its emphasis upon the experience of justification by faith.

The new group, and especially Barth, do not admit themselves to be a new school, but consider their work as the necessary criticism of every theology, as a critical footnote to be placed under all theological and ecclesiastical activity, or as a bit of cinnamon strewn on every theological dish which present-day Protestantism is enjoying.

Barth, as Pastor of a church in Switzerland, within hearing of the big guns of the war, and seeing and feeling the effects of the great catastrophe, was under the task of preaching. He felt the utter inadequacy of current theology which speaks about incidentals of historic explanations, of textual conjectures, of psychological data, but not of the essential and paradoxical data that the absolute and holy God has a specific message for man; all the exegetic work, all the work given by a better knowledge of the historic situation are of no use for the conscience in its terrible need when it feels itself contemplated in the eternal eye, which looks through all the barriers we erect against it. The theology of Barth must be considered as an expression of that deep and incurable crisis into which men, the church as well as theology, are thrown irresistibly as soon as they are confronted with the living God. Crisis is the only word which depicts adequately this situation; and in fact, this crisis always breaks out when God, the totally other, "totaliter aliter," is discovered to be something quite different from anything that men thought of him in their religious convictions. This crisis starts from the conflict between the eternal human desire to know God, to make an image of him, to possess

him, to express his being in human form, and the terrifying discovery that there is no way from man to God, that no human thinking, not even the highest moral or religious vision, can get hold of him.

Barth blames the whole modern theology for laying too much emphasis on the immanence of God, and for suppressing thereby the distance between God and men. The assurance with which modern theology speaks of God is nothing else than a manifestation of the same revolutionary spirit which led humanity to the fall. In the eyes of the Barthians, the theology of Schleiermacher, Harnack, Troeltsch, Bousset, and Wernle are designated as "Kulturprotestantismus," a deplorable deviation from the truth underlying the Christian religion, a kind of theological fall for which they do penance in sackcloth and ashes.

Barth, in his task of preaching, noticed that the reformers, in all their preaching and writing, are bearing testimony of another, or pointing to the totaliter aliter. The reformers got this from St. Paul, who bears testimony and points to God. Jesus walks here upon earth, and what is his mission? To bear testimony of the totally other. And so Barth also went through the Old Testament and found evidence of pointing to God. This, I find, gives the Barthians or the Theology of Crisis their authority for their theology.

Here it would be well to describe the picture in Barth's home, which had a great influence upon his theology. He once said to a student, (pointing to the picture), "I get most of my theology from that picture." The picture is a painting of the Crucifixion by Matthias Grunewald, which was placed in the church at Isenheim in 1510. It is a picture of contrasts. The crucifixion is set against a background of darkness, denoting the unknown and mystery. The letters I. N. R. I. appear at the top of the cross. On the right side one sees John the Baptist, a powerful, unshakable figure, full of confident assurance, with a great outstretched finger pointing to Christ, the Lamb of God. At the feet of John the Baptist is a little lamb, clasping a cross. On the left side, overcome with anguish, is Mary in a nun's robe, sinking into the Apostle John's arms. At the foot of the cross is another nun, Mary Magdalene, wringing her hands wildly because of the terrible fate which has overtaken her Lord.

The pointing finger of the Baptist is religion, piety and experience. What is behind and within? Beside the mighty finger of John stand the words: "He must increase, but I must decrease."

The mother of Jesus, Magdalene and John indicate that it is possible to stand before the secret of the cross in helpless despair,

so long as one sees only the outward. Thus stands our whole age today, in fear and need, before the closed door of death, scarcely conscious of the news—the good news—that waits behind.

This altar picture at Isenheim was made, as were many other altars years and years ago, in panels that could be moved or turned around to fit the various seasons of the church year. So the picture of the crucifixion is literally a Door, and when the door is opened there is seen on the other side a new world, full of light and beauty.

There are four inner panels, and we shall describe them only briefly. The first panel shows the Annunciation to Mary, with the simple Gothic chapel window showing the bright afternoon sun and the angel of annunciation. In the second panel Mary sits in the open air, gazing with intense love on her sturdy little son, while behind angels are singing. On the third panel there is a high mountain, and one feels, rather than sees, the golden light of heaven—symbolizing the Divine Father. Around the light one sees cherubim encircling the Creator in joyous song. In the fourth panel Christ appears in a starry sky, with an aureole of shimmering beauty about his head. He has come forth from the tomb in a fiery red, wildly fluttering mantle. He is a blinding and glittering supernatural figure.

This whole picture is for Barth a just and impressive parable. It symbolizes for Barth this thought—out of life into death; out of death into life—which occupies the very middle point of the Bible. The door is all that many see. They stand before the outer picture of the cross with its pain and horror, and are dismayed. What does it mean? How can they believe in a God of love? They cannot, until they get the vision beyond the door, and the heavenly meaning of the whole is plain. Until we see the inward, we stand before the outward dumb and uncomprehending.

The spiritual forefathers of the whole movement are Blumhardt, Overbeck, Kutter, Dostoievsky, Kierkegaard; the Reformers, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli; and, first of all, St. Paul. Upon this subject investigations and studies are being made at the present time. R. Birch Hoyle, in his recent book, "The Teaching of Karl Barth," gives some thought to his phase of the movement.

Since the nature of this article is an introduction to the Theology of Crisis, a discussion of all the main and important doctrines of theology would make the article too long and abstract. In the next few paragraphs the writer is deeply indebted to the dynamic and thought-provoking book of Brunner's, "The Theology of Crisis."

When we consider their doctrine of God, we touch the center of their theology. They criticise very severely the doctrine of the immanence of God. God is transcendent. The Barthian basic thought is the same as Herman Kutter's—God is God, and Man is Man. God is hidden for man. He is the unknown God. God is in heaven. We are on the earth. What we call God is not the living God, but a human image of him. The crisis or conflict arises when man desires to know God and find him, and makes the discovery that there is no way from man to God.

According to the dialectic method, we are always between an "either" "or," a "yes" and "no," or between two poles of thought. It is a dualistic concept of God on the one hand and the world as we know it, on the other. Man may try to find God, but it will profit him nothing. There is no way from man to God. Barthianism has been called Neo-Calvinism. God is the sovereign God of Sinai.

Even in the revelation of Jesus Christ, God remains transcendent. Even here He is not accessible or graspable as the manifest deity. Jesus is from the other side, the God side. God crosses the boundary, the dividing chasm between God and man. God comes disguised, in a lowly figure. The chasm is bridged from God to man, and not from man to God. Jesus is unique. He is a Word, an act of God. He is what God has to say to us. The coming of Jesus Christ is not a supernatural miracle that we may or may not consider true. This is not within the province of human thought. A revelation that is capable of proof would not be a revelation, because then it would be subordinate to a superior principle. Then the human would be equal or superior to the divine. The historical appearance of the human personality is not as a revelation; it is revelation only in so far as in this historical human personality the eternal Son of God is recognized. The incognito of his historical appearance can be pierced only by the eyes of faith. Christ's origin is different from ours. The eternal Son of God must be seen by faith as the mystery of the man Jesus. This is the incarnate word of God. The privilege of seeing the real Christ is for the believer and not for the historian. If Jesus is merely a teacher, example, genius, then it does not matter whether he lived or not, whether the world remembers or forgets him. To admit the last sentence would be to believe in the immanence of God and the Barthian claims that the Christian faith has nothing in common with it. To prove that Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word, was God and became man, one cannot be a spectator, but must be a believer.

Briefly, What is sin, according to the crisis theology? Man's

will is in contradistinction to God's will. The original fellowship with God is broken. Man's will does not conform to the will of God; it appears as a crooked line, when tested by the straight rule of the law. Sin means that I am in wrong relation to God. Brunner, in "Der Mittler," is not concerned with particular sins, but with the irrationality of sin.

Man is separated from God. It is impossible for man to re-establish the broken personal relationship. God in his mercy threw a bridge between himself and man. God blazed a trail where man himself could not go. God takes the initiative and effects an entrance into the human sphere. God does this because he is a God of love. Forgiveness is not an idea or thought over which man himself has power. It is an act of God. God is a sovereign God. The condescension of God to man constitutes the mystery of divine revelation and reconciliation in the incarnate and crucified Christ. God removes the contradiction by bearing it himself; this is the cross. The chasm is bridged and the door is opened, and the new life beyond history is founded. At this point in this finite world, entrance is made into the eternal world of God.

Faith belongs in the realm of theology and not psychology. Only a believer can discuss it. Soeren Kierkegaard defined faith as: "Trusting God is to be alone in a great sea with 70,000 fathoms under one." Man clings and holds on to the hand that is stretched out from the beyond. Faith is an act of acceptance that is a decision. Salvation is not at once completed, but it is begun. Salvation is a promise. Man realizes his helplessness and hopelessness and desires deliverance. So repentance is despair of self, a radical turning away from elf-reliance to trust in God alone. The life of a Christian is never a possession. He never becomes content. He remains in a state of tension. The life of a Christian is decision. To be a Christian upon earth means to know that we are called through Christ, that is, that God has accepted us. Our citizenship now as Christians is in heaven. The Kingdom of God cannot be realized here on earth. The kingdom of God is not coming by the striving of men heavenward, but it comes earthward, from heaven to earth. The consummation of the Christian life is in the other world.

We have left for our last consideration the most difficult idea of the theology of Crisis—the Bible. I fear that some have given up trying to understand this movement by beginning it with their interpretation of the Word. There seems lack of unity among the leaders of the movement here. From Barth one can deduct a literal, verbal inspiration view of scripture, and from Brunner a very liberal view, accepting all the latest findings of historical and

textual criticisms. In the Bible we find not the history of man, but the history of God. We do not find the way to form the right human thoughts about God. The Bible tells us not how we should talk with God, but what he says to us. The believer finds the central and unifying theme, the revelation of God, in Jesus Christ. The believer and not the historian finds the whence and not the what of the character of the incarnate Word, in Jesus Christ. We hope more light will be given upon their view of the Bible; especially would I desire something exhaustive and penetrating from the pen of Bultmann.

In the Christian Century of March 26, 1930, page 395, there appeared an excellent sermon by Brunner on Zaccheus, the Publican. Let us analyze this sermon in the light of the foregoing. The text is the story of Zaccheus in Luke 19. The paradoxical method is used. In speaking of money he says, "Mammon is the opposite of God, and so the Lord characterized it—Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." Zaccheus follows the pursuit of money and stands in opposition to God. The quiet cry of God urges Zaccheus to see the prophet. Along comes Jesus, the only one who was able to say, "I am Come." He is not in the world as man but as God in man. He is from above; we are from beneath. He is the one through whom God deals with us, in whom God himself comes to us. He is not our model, not our greatest religious genius, not a prophet, not a founder of a religion, not like ourselves, but something different. He bears testimony of the love of the totally other.

As you will recall, the Pharisees murmured. This was due to their secret pride of establishing differences among themselves. Before God we are all one,—the one sinner, Adam. God crosses the differences and variations which are man-made, and comes to all the people of the world. For you are all one, all in need of a physician. The only real difference between us is that some of us see this and others do not.

Jesus goes, not to make a convert, but because he loves him. He loves him unconditionally. People do not take to this gospel because we do not care to confess that we are all alike bankrupt. In pride we want to hold spiritual property. This marks the contrast between us and Christ. For Christ makes an end of all spiritual property. He says in effect, that you are all bankrupt, but God will give you all things if you will only let him—by recognizing your bankruptcy. God comes to him; the old creation has passed away, he becomes a new man. Zaccheus is willing to restore fourfold.

The bond between Zaccheus and the world is broken. Something new happens within the man, he conceives the desire, he him-

self makes the decision, and rises to do a deed. This decision is faith.

Jesus says, "This day is salvation come to this house." This day something has happened, which comes from the eternal and leads man to the eternal. And so "He also is a son of Abraham, a part of that great processional which is testimony of the totally other. The light from the eternal shines in the heart of Zaccheus and you have a reflection of the eternal, the infinite. This light from behind and within the door shines in Zaccheus' heart and it is not that the reflection or light in the heart of man calls the light of God to shine.

Barth definitely threw down the gauntlet to the cherished German view that religion is a branch of culture and is to be understood and estimated by the standards which culture provides.

Barth's real achievement is his success in making the theocentric emphasis in Europe at a time when defeat and revolution threatened to lead to chaos, and to warding off pessimism as to human life pointing to the realm of the eternal. Barth is really a reaction against the finite conception of God as of H. G. Wells, and is rightfully such a reaction.

Let us consider the elements of strength in this movement. No doubt it exerted a great influence upon public opinion in favor of the church at the end of the war, with its aftermath of pessimism, disillusion and defeatism. It came at a time of theological bankruptcy, and the Barthians were not slow in proclaiming this fact, and offering something definite and absolute in a time of chaos and relativity. They struck a note of reality at a time when everything seemed in a state of flux. The Barthian movement enlisted brilliant and earnest men who are keen critics. The Barthian movement came as a help to faith from many blind alleys of intellectual and cultural reflections. The theology of Crisis is theocentric and attacks the anthropocentric tendencies, philosophies and theologies, cultural protestantism and non-theological humanism which have been developing for many years. Barthian theology is a wholesome antidote for the easy-going optimism of the above mentioned current thought and tendencies. Their idea of sin with guilt is a point of strength in our complex social life of today. The fact that the Barthian theologians do not claim a finished system, but a growing and developing insight into theology is an element of strength.

The points of weakness are many and varied. The philosophical basis is skepticism, which will turn into an impersonal philosophy, and religious faith cannot be looked up to with such a basis. It has a very pessimistic view of human nature. Human nature

is bad enough without putting it so extremely far from the good or from God. Barth puts the minus sign before everything human. The only way to test or find the authenticity of this theology is in the way it meets a human need. They contradict this method by brushing aside the attainments or theologies that were satisfactory and met a particular human need. They are too dogmatic in their position, and are apt to become intellectually intolerant to others of different philosophies and theologies. I would question the use of their dialectic method of the either-or situation. "Religion is, as they would have it, not so much a matter of clear alternatives, complete breaks in nature, infinite chasms, sharp contrasts, paradoxes, and crises, as it is a realm in which the shadings and gradations are exceedingly fine and the colors delicate, rather than sharp and outstanding." Barthianism fails to give a great social emphasis and is too individualistic. It makes the mistake of thinking that an institutionalized church is the same as a social note in theology. Barthianism can become the norm of a pulpit-centered church life, but is handicapped and meets difficulties in a pew-centered religious community. Our greatest criticism is their concept of God. Their God is not primarily a God of love, but more of a Judge. The extreme transcendence of God brings about an aloofness. A doctrine of transcendence, to be effective today, must be coupled with a doctrine of immanence. The Barthian movement expels from theology any semblance of immanence. This, I believe, is their greatest defect. It is because of this fact, I believe, that the Barthian movement will never be strong in America; because our approach to life, religion, the Bible and God is so different from theirs. It is extremely difficult to find parallels in our thought and experience to correlate this new theology. The moment we do this, we are doing it an injustice and read into history what they are doing themselves by their dogmatic position and tendencies. It would be almost hopelessly impossible to impart to our younger generation by the technique of religious education the Barthian view and consistencies in regard to their views of the Bible.

We need more light on their explanation of the Word. The subjective side is almost entirely omitted. Brunner tries to correct this by using a statement of Luther, "Wer glaubet, der hat"—"Who believes, has." The Barthians lose sight of the great development of religions and civilization. They do not take into consideration the history of other religions.

It lacks a real social message, although it grew as a social movement, since it grew out of Barth's own passionate desire for the social welfare of the masses. It is an alarm theology, and no

doubt we are asking too much in desiring to know the place of personal religious life, especially the place of prayer and the Lord's Prayer.

The Barthians certainly smashed lots of ecclesiastical furniture and pottery to their assured and basic principles, but we wonder who is going to pick up the wreckage and put the place in order again. At any rate, the movement had strength, and should be studied, but it has apparently reached its zenith in Europe. It has some adherents outside of the church especially among theological students, and has attracted the favorable notice of such a figure as Keyserling. On the whole, the general impression I receive in my reading is that it has been viewed unfavorably in University circles, and although it has drawn the interest of some Catholics, it is now opposed by a strong group within its own Protestant field. A lasting influence seems to be handicapped by its insistence that a 20th Century religion shall use terms and conceptions drawn from an age with an entirely different philosophical view.

After this criticism is written, I wonder whether it is not a little too early to criticise so severely, and whether we ought to wait until more expositions appear for us American readers. Perhaps we should await further developments of the movement.

In conclusion, I am suggesting a plan or method of study. It is very easy to begin with the wrong book, and after spending money and valuable time, to give up the task and miss the joy of new sunshine, light and fresh air in preaching. Here is a big challenge for the intellectual manhood of the ministry. A thorough study is bound to add power and new vitality to one's preaching. The first book to read is Brunner's, "The Theology of Crisis." Then read the Christian Century sermon mentioned in this article. The best German book of sermons is Barth and Thurneysen; "Suchet Gott, so werdet ihr leben." The sermons which it would be best to read first are Nos. 3, 4, 9, 6, 7, and then the others. In the German one should follow with Barth, "Dogmatik," vol. 1, and Brunner, "Der Mittler." Many ministers have purchased Barth, "The Word of God and the Word of Man." In this book, read first chapters 1, 4 and 6. Anyone wishing a criticism of Schleiermacher should read Brunner, "Die Mystik und das Wort." Barth's "Roemerbrief" can best be used more as a reference book, after one has studied some of the other writings. Thus far about 33 books have been written by the Barthians and by others, explaining the theology of Crisis or giving a critical evaluation of it. Many articles have appeared in American, English, and German religious journals and magazines.

Mohammedanismus und Christentum.

Von Professor Dr. Grützmacher, Wiesbaden.

Der kürzlich verstorbene Göttinger Kirchenhistoriker Mirbt hat einmal erklärt: „Im Grund ist der einzige Rivale des Christentums der Mohammedanismus" und der Berliner Missionsprofessor J. Richter meint, der Schwerpunkt der Mohammedanermission liegt zurzeit in dem Geisteskampf, der literarischen und wissenschaftlichen Tätigkeit zur inneren Ueberwindung des Islams. Sind diese beiden Feststellungen durchaus richtig, so ist eine der Hauptaufgaben der christlichen Apologetik **die religionsgeschichtliche Auseinandersetzung zwischen Mohammedanismus und Christentum, deren Grundzüge im Folgenden dargeboten werden sollen.**

Mußten zwischen Buddhismus und Christentum jegliche historische Beziehungen für die älteste Zeit als höchst unwahrscheinlich abgewiesen werden, so ist es umgekehrt ganz selbstverständlich, daß **der Islam** dessen Zeitrechnung erst im Jahre 622 nach Christus beginnt, **vom Christentum beeinflußt ist.** In Arabien lebte zur Zeit Mohammeds eine ganze Reihe von Christen, die im Süden von Abessinien eingedrungen waren, und außerdem im Nordosten der arabischen Halbinsel in den Grenzgebieten des Oströmischen Reiches. Von da aus waren Kenntnisse vom Christentum in das Innere Arabiens eingedrungen. Mohammed selbst kam als reisender Kaufmann in seinen jüngeren Jahren mit diesen christlichen Kreisen in Berührung. Noch stärker war allerdings in der werdenden Umwelt des Islams **das Judentum** vertreten. Denn nach der zweiten Zerstörung Jerusalems und noch stärker nach den großen Kriegen Hadrians und Trajans waren zahlreiche Juden nach Arabien ausgewandert; besonders stark verbreitet waren sie im Süden, wo sogar einzelne jüdische Herrscher vorkamen. Eine große jüdische Kolonie lebte in der Stadt Medina, der Hauptstätte der späteren Wirksamkeit Mohammeds. Infolgedessen kannte Mohammed auch die das Christentum vorbereitende jüdische Religion. Allerdings waren weder das Christentum noch das Judentum, das Mohammed kennenlernte, in ihrer Urgestalt in Arabien erhalten. Das alttestamentliche Judentum war stark von talmudischen Gedankengängen durchsetzt, das Christentum mit manichäischen und gnostischen Elementen versetzt, sodaß es den altkirchlichen Sekten näher stand, als dem offiziellen Christentum der Kirche.

Diese Tatbestände reflektieren sich deutlich in den **mannigfachen Bezugnahmen des Koran auf Judentum und Christentum.** Namen wie Adam, Abraham, Jakob, Moses, Salomon, Zacharias, Jesus kommen im Koran vor. Die Josephgeschichte des Alten Testaments wird wiederholt, aber auch zugleich mit allerlei wunderlichen Zu-

sätzen versehen. Von **Jesus** weiß der Koran, daß er nach christlicher Ueberliefrung von der Jungfrau Maria geboren ist, die allerdings mit Mirjam der Schwester des Moses verwechselt wird. Auch Wundertaten Jesu werden berichtet und anerkannt, dagegen sein Kreuzestod abgelehnt. Die Vergottung Christi wird verworfen und damit auch das christliche Trinitätsdogma, das dahin mißverstanden wird, als sei der Vater, der Sohn und Maria zu einer göttlichen Einheit zusammengefaßt. **Tiefer als diese äußerlichen Beziehungen geht die Verwandtschaft und Abhängigkeit des Islams von Judentum und Christentum im Aufbau seiner Religion.** Der islamische Monotheismus ist fraglos eine Schöpfung des Alten Testaments. Die sittlichen Gebote Mohammeds berühren sich auf das Engste mit den mosaischen. Die Gerichtspredigt Mohammeds hat ihre Anknüpfung sowohl an die Drohungen der alttestamentlichen Propheten wie in noch stärkerem Maß an die Vorhersagung des Jüngsten Gerichts durch Jesus. Auch in der weiteren Ausmalung der eschatologischen Ereignisse, sowie in der Schilderung von Himmel und Hölle sind Spuren der christlichen Gedankenwelt nicht zu verkennen, wenn sich auch neben ihren Einwirkungen aus der persischen Zarathustrareligion gerade hier nicht verkennen lassen.

Auf Grund all dieser Beobachtungen ergibt sich, daß der Islam ein durchaus sekundäres, synkretistisches Gebilde in der Religionsgeschichte ist, bei dessen Zustandekommen Judentum und Christentum entscheidende Einflüsse geübt haben. Manche Forscher wollen ihm darum jede Selbständigkeit als Weltreligion absprechen. Hat ihn doch Harnack einfach der christlichen Sektengeschichte einzureihen gesucht und der Philosoph Spengler will ihn höchstens in demselben Sinn eine neue Religion sein lassen, wie man das vom Protestantismus gegenüber dem mittelalterlichen Christentum behaupten könne. Sind diese Urteile auch zu weit gehend, so bleibt doch der Tatbestand bestehen, daß der Mohammedanismus die unoriginellste Schöpfung der Religionsgeschichte ist.

Verliert für unsre Meinung der Islam dadurch an geistigen und religiösen Werten, so sieht man auf islamischer Seite diese Beziehung wesentlich anders an. **Der Mohammedanismus hält sich selbst für eine Reinigung und Fortbildung der jüdisch-christlichen Religionsgeschichte.** Die jüdisch christliche Religion — so meint er — ist durch die „Schriftbesitzer" verunreinigt, die allerlei falsche Lehren aufgebracht haben, während der Mohammedanismus die Zurückführung auf die echte Urreligion bringt. Heißt es doch einmal in Bezug auf Abraham: „Abraham war weder Jude noch Christ, sondern Hanif und Moslim und Feind der Abgötter." Mohammed hat die Aufgabe, der Reinigung und der Vollendung der jüdisch-christlichen Religion. Er beseitigt die morschen Aeste und

setzt dem Bau die fehlende Krone auf. Mohammed ist der letzte und abschließende Prophet in der Religionsgeschichte und steht als solcher auch über Moses und Jesus. Mit einer relativen Anerkennung der jüdischen und christlichen Offenbarung verbindet sich die schroffe Leugnung ihrer Absolutheit. Gerade in dieser Stellungnahme des Islams liegt die besondre Schwierigkeit seine Anhänger für das Christentum zu gewinnen. Denn diese sind zwar durchaus bereit, einzelne Gedankengänge des Christentums und gerade auch die Gestalt Jesu positiv zu werten, aber doch immer nur als Vorstufen für Mohammed und seine Gedankenwelt.

Infolgedessen ist es notwendig, **gerade die Unterschiede zwischen beiden Religionen**, trotz ihrer geschichtlichen und sachlichen Berührungen **mit besondrer Schärfe zu formulieren** und zur Entscheidung für die eine oder andre Religion zu drängen. Islam und Christentum besitzen beide ein heiliges Buch, dem sie grundlegenden Wert beilegen. Sie sind beide Buchreligionen und führen diese Schriften letztlich auf Gott zurück. **Aber Koran und Bibel unterscheiden sich prinzipiell voneinander,** wenn man sie genauer miteinander vergleicht. Das gilt zunächst in formaler Richtung. Nur ganz wenige Abschnitte des Korans sind wirklich ästhetisch schön und poetisch eindrücklich formuliert. Infolgedessen hat selbst ein so weitherziger Religionsphilosoph wie Pfleiderer erklärt: „Der Stil des Koran ist durchweg gereimte Prosa, bei den Sprüchen aus älterer Zeit noch prägnant nach Art der alten Orakelsprüche, bald aber mehr und mehr weitschweifig, voll künstlicher Rethorik und zahllosen Wiederholungen, eine unerquickliche Lektüre für einen Menschen von gesundem Geschmack." Der Hauptgrund für diesen Tatbestand wird darin liegen, daß der Koran inhaltlich verhältnismäßig wenig Religion und Geschichte und statt dessen umsomehr Recht und ethische Kasuistik enthält. Parallen zwischen dem Koran und den christlichen Evangelien gibt es überhaupt nicht, wohl aber gleichen zahlreichen Ausführungen des Korans den mittleren Gesetzesbüchern des Pentateuch, da man auf beiden Seiten bis in die Einzelheiten des Erb- und Eherechtes eingeht. Auch der Gottesgedanke beherrscht nicht entfernt den gesamten Stoff des Koran in dem Maß, wie es im Neuen Testament der Fall ist. Die Gegensätzlichkeit zwischen Mohammedanismus und Christentum — die für uns zugleich den Charakter der Inferiorität des ersteren gegenüber den letzteren an sich trägt — kommt bei einer genaueren Vergleichung zwischen Koran und Bibel zum Ausdruck.

Grundgehalt des Korans und der Predigt Mohammeds ist die **Unentrinnbarkeit des nahenden Endgerichtes und der Einheit Gottes.** Mit Recht hat ein guter Kenner des Islams, Goldzieher, das Verhältnis dieser beiden Gedanken so bestimmt, daß die genauere

Fassung des Gottesgedankens in Abhängigkeit von der Gerichtsverkündigung steht: „Die monotheistische Idee ist bei Mohammed umgekehrt erst die notwendige Folge des Glaubens an die schrankenlose Macht des Herrschers des Gerichtstages und die unbegrenzte Abhängigkeit des Menschen von dessen unverantwortlichem Urteilsspruch. Ein Gefühl, so absoluter Abhängigkeit, wie es Mohammed erfüllte, konnte nur einer, durch Zugesellung nicht verminderten Allmacht gelten, dem allein einzigen Allah." Mohammeds religiöse Grundtendenz kommt in dem Ausspruch zu Tag: „Wahrlich die Strafe deines Herrn wird eintreffen, welche niemand abwenden kann am Tag, wo der Himmel erschüttert und Berge sich fortbewegen werden. Wehe an jenem Tag dem Leugner." Für das Verhältnis dieses Gottesgedankens zu dem jüdisch-christlichen wird man sich dem Urteil des Mohammedanermissionars Simon anschließen können, wenn er sagt: „Der Gott des Islams ist nicht der des Alten Testaments, vielleicht der des talmudischen Judentums. Er ist der Gott der fürchterlichsten Willkür, der kein Vertrauen einflößt, sondern nur Furcht." Allerdings soll nicht geleugnet werden, daß unter den sogenannten 99 schönen Namen Allahs, die man aus dem Koran zusammengestellt hat, auch die der Güte und Barmherzigkeit vorkommen. Diese Güte aber wird im Mohammedanismus wesentlich mit der Schöpfertätigkeit Gottes identifiziert, die wir ebensowenig als besondre Güte empfinden wie die Tätigkeit menschlicher Eltern zur Erzeugung ihrer Kinder. Die Barmherzigkeit Allahs besteht vor allen Dingen darin, daß er das Endgericht nicht ohne vorherige Ankündigung durch seine Propheten, besonders Mohammed, eintreten läßt. Zugleich gibt er durch diese Verhaltungsmaßregeln an, wie ein Mensch dem Gericht entgehen kann. **Allah ist und bleibt im wesentlichen doch Richter-Gott, allerdings ein Richter, der eine zeitlang Geduld beweist und eine Reihe von Besserungsvorschlägen macht, ehe er das Endurteil fällt.** Auch der christliche Gott ist gewiß — vom Alten Testament her — ein heiliger Gott und der Gerichtsgedanke hat auch in der Predigt Jesu seine Stellung behalten. Aber **das eigentümliche Wesen des christlichen Gottes ist doch die Liebe,** die die Heiligkeit in ihren Dienst stellt, die das Gericht verkündet, um es durch Gnade zu überwinden. **So ergibt sich der grundlegende Unterschied zwischen den beiden Religionen, daß bei Mohammed Gott wesentlich Richter, im Christentum Gott wesentlich Retter ist.**

Aber auch in der näheren Ausgestaltung des Monotheismus unterscheidet sich der mohammedanische und christliche Gottesgedanke. Mohammed hat seinen Monotheismus nicht nur in Gegensatz gestellt zum arabischen Polytheismus, sondern auch zum christlichen Trinitätsglauben. Selbst wenn wir von dem oben mitgeteilten Miß-

verständnis des christlichen Dogmas durch Mohammed absehen, bleibt ein Gegensatz. **Mohammeds Gottesbegriff ist deistisch** gerichtet; zwischen ihm und der Welt besteht im Grund nur eine doppelte Beziehung: am Anfang durch die Schöpfung, am Ende durch das Gericht; zwischendurch läßt er die Welt und den einzelnen Menschen ganz die eignen Wege gehen. Im Christentum dagegen tritt mitten in der Geschichte Gott selbst erlösend in die Welt ein und wird dem Einzelnen ganz persönlich immanent durch das Eingehen seines Geistes in das individuelle Innere der erlösten Menschen. Das Christentum läßt Gott in Jesus und im Geist so eigentümlich und real in der Weltwirklichkeit werden, daß es dies beiden Wesenserscheinungen Gottes auch in seine ewige Persönlichkeit zurückverlegt und infolgedessen seinen Monotheismus trinitarisch erweitert. Auch Mohammed kommt in Wirklichkeit nicht mit seinem weltenfernen und starren Gottesbegriff aus, sondern ist genötigt, zwischen Allah und die Menschen als Vermittler die Engel zu setzen. Der Engel Gabriel bringt Mohammed die Offenbarung Gottes und jeder einzelne Mensch erscheint von Schutzengeln umgeben. Infolgedessen wird der aus dem späteren Judentum stammende Gedanke von besondern Zwischenwesen zwischen Gottheit und Menschheit wieder aufgenommen und **der echte Monotheismus dadurch viel stärker gefährdet als bei der trinitarischen Ausgestaltung des christlichen Gottesgedankens,** für den auch die Engel rein geschöpfliche, die Erlösung keineswegs vermittelnde Wesen sind.

Als zweiter Bestandteil des islamischen Glaubensbekenntnisses kommt Mohammed als der alleinige Prophet Allahs in Betracht. In der ältesten Ueberlieferung hat Mohammed für sich keineswegs Sündlosigkeit und Vollkommenheit und auch nicht die Kraft, Wunder zu tun, in Anspruch genommen. Er erscheint vielmehr als echter irrender und sündiger Mensch. Müssen wir uns auch hüten, die streng christlichen Maßstäbe an Mohammeds Erdenleben anzulegen, so beobachten wir doch bei ihm eine Reihe von Zügen, die auch einen herabgeminderten sittlichen Ideal einem Propheten nicht entsprechen. Dazu wird man etwa eine Reihe grausamer Handlungen, wie die Hinschlachtung 600 gefangener Juden zu rechnen haben, diplomatische Täuschungsversuche bei Verhandlungen mit seinen Gegnern, zunehmende Sinnlichkeit im Alter, die ihm gestattete auf Grund angeblicher besonderer Offenbarungen noch mehr als vier Frauen in Anspruch zu nehmen. Dem gegenüber läßt die geschichtliche Ueberlieferung Jesus als sündenrein und besonders als Feind von aller Grausamkeit und Unwahrhaftigkeit und erst recht sinnlicher Exzesse erscheinen. **Schon eine Vergleichung der Charaktere Jesu und Mohammeds unter reinen humanen Gesichtspunkten wird zu Gunsten des ersteren ausfallen.** Für die religiöse Betrachtung

erscheint es als Vorzug, daß Jesus sich bestimmt auf die Seite Gottes gestellt hat und auch als solcher geglaubt und angebetet sein wollte, während Mohammed einmal ausdrücklich erklärte: „Preise mich nicht, wie Jesus den Sohn Mirjams." — Simon wird darum aus der Erfahrung des Missionars heraus richtig urteilen, wenn er sagt: „Der Mohammedaner, der Jesus überhaupt annimmt, nimmt ihn als Gott an. Jede Abschwächung dieser Einzigartigkeit Jesu raubt der evangelischen Verkündigung an den Moslim die Berechtigung, denn nur dann ist Jesus mehr als Mohammed, wenn er der Sohn ist."

Ein weiterer Unterschied zwischen Jesus und Mohammed ergibt sich auch aus dem Blick auf ihr **Ende.** Je weiter das Leben Mohammeds vorschritt, desto behaglicher und bequemer wurde es. Zwar behielt Mohammed verhältnismäßig einfache Lebensformen, hielt keine Sklaven, nahm auch geringen Anteil von der Kriegsbeute. Aber er umgab sich doch in seinem Haus mit zahlreichen Frauen und Kindern und ließ sich von diesen verwöhnen und pflegen. So starb er ruhig und behaglich im Jahre 632 auf seiner häuslichen Lagerstatt in den Armen seiner Lieblingsfrau Aischa. Je mehr Jesu Leben sich dem Ende näherte, um so mehr bewahrheitete sich an ihm das Wort, daß zwar die Füchse Gruben, die Vögel unter dem Himmel Nester, des Menschen Sohn aber keine Stätte habe, wohin er sein Haupt legen könne. Die Zahl seiner Feinde wuchs stetig, die Treue seiner Jünger wurde immer unzuverlässiger. Sein Ende wurde das Kreuz mit seinen harten Qualen, unter dem ihn nur von Ferne Mutterliebe und johanneische Jüngertreue stärkten. **Wendet man als Maßstab für die Beurteilung gerade religiöser Propheten den Blick auf ihr Ende an, so unterscheidet sich deutlich, das Kreuz Jesu und der Tod des in seinem Heim sanft entschlummerten Mohammed.** Im Mohammedanismus lebt dadurch auf der einen Seite eine starke Neigung, den Kreuzestod zu ignorieren, auf der andern Seite eine Furcht vor seiner faszinierenden Kraft, seiner verlockenden Wirkung — um Ausdrücke Nietzsches zu gebrauchen. Eine spätere mohammedanische Legende läßt darum den wiederkehrenden Jesus sein Kreuz eigenhändig zerbrechen — eine Andeutung dafür, in welchem Maß man das Kreuz als für Jesus charakteristisch empfand —, ein Hinweis für das Christentum, gerade bei der Verkündigung Jesu an den Mohammedanismus die Gestalt des Gekreuzigten in den Vordergrund zu rücken.

In dem Gekreuzigten erscheint besonders deutlich das **Christentum als Religion der Versöhnung und Erlösung.** Gott überwindet von sich aus aber nicht ohne eigenes Opfer — die Distanz zur sündigen Menschheit und wird dadurch frei und fähig zur Erlösung

und Vergebung. Dieser ganze Gedankenkreis fehlt aber vollkommen im Mohammedanismus. Er ist **reine Gesetzesreligion.** Gott stellt bestimmte Forderungen und gibt einzelne Gebote. Diese ist der Mensch von sich zu erfüllen in der Lage. Tut er es, dann wird ihm der entsprechende Lohn von Gott durch Versetzung in das Paradies zuteil, befolgt er aber die Gebote nicht, so empfängt er die gerechte Strafe in der Hölle. Der Islam baut das Verhältnis zwischen Gott und Menschen durchaus auf den Moralismus. Trotz aller Betonung der Abhängigkeit des Menschen von Gott — bedeutet doch das Wort Islam Gottergebenheit —, rechnet doch der Mohammedanismus auf der andern Seite durchaus mit der menschlichen Leistungsfähigkeit. Heißt es doch in der die sittlichen Forderungen zusammenfassenden zweiten Sure des Korans: „Wer das Gebet verrichtet und die Armensteuer leistet und diejenigen, die ihren Vertrag erfüllen und die geduldig sind im Unglück und in der Not, die sind es, die das Rechte erkennen und die sind die Gottesfürchtigen." Menschliche Leistungen bedingen mithin die Anerkennung der Gottesfurcht und geben die Sicherung im Gericht für gerecht befunden zu werden. **Der christlichen Erlösungsreligion steht im Mohammedanismus wie im Judentum und in der Zarathustrareligion die Gesetzes- und Leistungsreligion gegenüber.**

In der Durchführung der einzelnen sittlichen Forderungen begegnet man ganz ähnlichen wie sie im Dekalog zusammengefaßt und von Christus in seiner Bergpredigt aufgenommen sind. Heißt es doch im Koran: „Behandle die Eltern mit Güte, tötet nicht eure Kinder, begeht nicht Unsittlichkeiten, tötet nicht die von Gott für unverletzlich erklärte Seele. Rührt nicht das Gut der Waisen an, gebt rechtes Maß und Gewicht. Wenn ihr redet, so redet wahr, haltet den Vertrag Gottes." Diese sittlichen Gebote sollen nicht nur äußerlich befolgt werden, sondern auch von einer entsprechenden inneren Gesinnung begleitet sein, ohne daß diese allerdings eine solche Vertiefung empfängt, wie sie Jesus in der Bergrede vollzogen hat. Eine Veräußerlichung der mohammedanischen **Sittlichkeit** vollzieht sich durch ihre immer enger werdende **Verknüpfung mit dem Recht** und seinen erzwingbaren Forderungen. Schon der Koran enthält ganz genaue rechtliche Bestimmungen über das Ehe- und Erbschaftsrecht, über die prozentualen Anteile der Kinder an der Hinterlassenschaft der Eltern. Umgekehrt ist es gerade die Tendenz Jesu gewesen, die im späteren Judentum vollzogene Verklammerung von Sittlichkeit und Recht zu lösen, etwa die Form des gerichtlichen Eides aus der religiösen Gemeinde wieder auszuscheiden. **So steht sich denn im Christentum und Islam gegenüber: eine vom Recht geschiedene reine Sittlichkeit und eine immer**

mehr sich in Recht verwandelnde und darum ihre Sonderart verlierende Ethik.

Im Zusammenhang mit diesen Tatbeständen steht es, daß der Mohammedanismus immer unmittelbarer und direkter in **staatliche und politische Verhältnisse** eingegriffen und sich aller dazu nötiger Mittel und Verfahrungsweisen bedient hat. Am schärfsten spricht sich diese Stellungnahme konkret aus in der Forderung des sogenannten **heiligen Krieges.** Heißt es doch in einer Sure des Korans: „Kämpfet wider jene, die nicht glauben an Allah, bis das sie eigenhändig den Tribut gezahlt haben und gedemütigt sind." Das Ziel des heiligen Krieges ist danach die äußere Unterwerfung unter die mohammedanische Herrschaft, um durch entsprechende Tribut- und Steuerzahlung die finanzielle und wirtschaftliche Kraft des islamischen Staates zu stärken. Damit ist auf der einen Seite allerdings die Religion entlastet, sofern nicht eigentlich diese durch das Mittel des weltlichen Schwertes ausgebreitet werden soll. Auf der andern Seite befremdet es aber außerordentlich, daß man die Ungläubigen ruhig ungläubig lassen will, sich nicht um ihren Gewinn für den wahren Glauben bemüht, sondern sich mit ihrer politischen und wirtschaftlichen Abhängigmachung begnügt. In der Tat ist die **rein religiöse Mission,** wie man sie von einer ihres Wertes bewußten Weltreligion erwarten sollte, im Islam stets stark in den Hintergrund getreten. Seine große Ausbreitung hat sich wesentlich im Gefolg der politischen Ausdehnung der islamischen Staaten vollzogen und sodann vielfach dadurch, daß islamische Kaufleute in niedriger stehenden Völkern, wie in denen Afrikas und in den unteren Schichten des Chinesentums eine unwillkürliche und wenig religiöse Propaganda trieben. Die heutigen Versuche des Islams eine rein religiöse Propaganda in Europa und wohl auch in Amerika zu treiben geht auf bestimmte und begrenzte Kreise des Islams zurück, die vornehmlich in Indien und zwar in der Stadt Lahore ihren Sitz haben. Für sie ist der Islam die rationale Urreligion der Menschheit überhaupt, so daß im Grund jeder Mensch, der seine natürliche Vernunft sprechen läßt, ein Anhänger des Islams ist. Man verzichtet im Grund darauf, den Islam als spezifische und eigenartige Weltreligion zu begreifen. Aber selbst bei dieser begrenzten Zielsetzung sind **die Erfolge einer rein geistigen Mission des Islams in den christlichen Ländern noch geringere als die des Buddhismus.**

Ein letzter Unterschied zwischen Islam und Christentum ergibt sich daraus, daß auf der einen Seite die engste **Verbindung zwischen staatlicher und religiöser Gemeinschaft** besteht, während auf der andern Seite mindestens prinzipiell von dem Staat die besondere Gemeinschaft der Kirche unterschieden wird. Zutreffend hat einer

der besten Kenner des Islams der Professor Hurgronje in Leyden festgestellt: „Die Schöpfung Mohammeds war eine Religionsgemeinde, aber ebenso ein Staat und zwar ein Militärstaat mit zunehmend aggressiver Tendenz. Mohammed ist in demselben Maße Prophet wie Staatsmann, seine Gemeinschaft im gleichen Maß Kirche und Staat." Die alte Form der Theokratie, des Kirchenstaates, aber auch der Staatskirche hat sich bei ihm erhalten. Infolgedessen gehen religiöse und staatliche Ordnung, geistliche und weltliche Maßnahmen unentwirrbar ineinander über. Jesus aber hat umgekehrt die religiöse und staatliche Gemeinschaft auf das Bestimmteste unterschieden und darum verlangen können: „Gebet dem Kaiser, was des Kaisers und Gott, was Gottes ist." Er hat infolgedessen die Form, in der weltliche Herrscher in ihrer Sphäre sich durchsetzen als für seine Gemeinde völlig ungeeignet erklärt und die gegensätzliche Form unbeschränkter, demütiger Dienstbereitschaft aller Glieder untereinander verlangt. **Urchristentum und Urislam unterscheiden sich auf das Bestimmteste durch ihre verschiedene soziologische Struktur.** Auf der einen Seite steht die Bildung einer rein religiösen, sich nach besondern sittlichen Prinzipien ordnende Gemeinschaft, auf der andern Seite eine restlose Verbindung von staatlicher und religiöser Gesellung und darum die Uebertragung der staatlichen Zwangshandlungen auch in die religiöse Sphäre. Im Lauf der Geschichte hat allerdings auch im Christentum eine enge Verbindung zwischen staatlicher und religiöser Gemeinschaft sich ausgebildet und über das Mittelalter hinaus sich auch im europäischen Protestantismus bis in das beginnende 20. Jahrhundert weitgehend gehalten. Aber im amerikanischen Protestantismus und auch Katholizismus ist die Selbständigkeit der christlichen Gemeinschaftform wieder deutlicher hervorgetreten und auch die europäische Christenheit ist mehr und mehr auf dem Weg, sich der Unabhängigkeit ihrer kirchlichen Lebensform bewußt zu werden. Dadurch würde die Differenz zum Islam gesteigert werden, wenn sie sich nicht gerade in der neueren und neuesten Zeit auch im Islam der Unterschied der religiösen und politischen Gemeinschaftsform immer deutlicher geltend machte. Diese Entwicklung ist einmal dadurch herbeigeführt, daß ein sehr großer Teil, ja sogar der weitaus größere Teil der Bekenner des Islams garnicht in einer islamischen Staatsordnung lebt, sondern wie in Indien, in China, in Japan, in europäischen Ländern nicht unter islamischer, sondern unter christlicher oder heidnischer Obrigkeit steht. Aber selbst in der Türkei hat in der neuesten Zeit eine immer stärkere Trennung zwischen der islamischen Religion und zwischen der staatlichen Ordnung stattgefunden. Infolgedessen **nähern sich Islam und Christentum in der Gegenwart dadurch, daß beide mehr und mehr rein religiöse Ge-**

meinschaften werden und infolgedessen auf die Auseinandersetzung mit rein geistigen Mitteln angewiesen sind. In früheren Jahrhunderten bis nahe heran an die Gegenwart war der Uebertritt eines Islamgläubigen nicht nur für ihn selbst mit der allergrößten Gefahr bis zur Tötung verknüpft, sondern nicht minder auch für den Missionar, der als Urheber dieses Uebertrittes galt. Schwinden in Zukunft diese Hemmnisse, so ist damit der Aufnahme einer Islam-Mission eine gewisse Erleichterung gegeben. Allerdings wird man sich auch dann nicht überschwänglichen Hoffnungen hingeben dürfen. Denn auf der einen Seite ist im islamischem Kreis, wie der Türkei und auch Aegyptens, westliche Aufklärung in starkem Maß eingedrungen. Sie hat nicht nur die spezifisch islamischen Sitten und Glaubensvorstellungen zersetzt, sondern einen Skeptizismus gegen jede Religion und religiös bedingte Lebensordnung hervorgerufen. Infolgedessen findet gerade hier auch die christliche Verkündigung keinerlei Anklang. Auf der andern Seite aber bleiben bei den religiös gerichteten Anhängern des Mohammedanismus all die früher skizzierten Widerstände gegen das Christentum in Kraft. Infolgedessen wird die christliche Apologetik das Verhältnis von Islam und Christentum nach jeder Richtung immer gründlicher durchzuarbeiten haben, um der Mission gegenüber dem Islam wirklich geistig standhaltende und erfolgreiche Gedanken zur Verfügung zu stellen, wenn naturgemäß auch gerade hier der Beweis des Geistes und der Kraft im persönlich-religiösen Sinn allein die Entscheidung herbeiführen kann.

Die Apokryphen des Alten Testaments.

Ed. Schweizer, P. em., Marion, Ill. (90jährig. — Ed.)

Darüber ist schon viel geschrieben worden in alter und neuer Zeit. Zur Verfügung steht mir jedoch nur ein Artikel von E. Schuerer in Herzogs Real-Encyklopädie und etwas von Hengstenberg. Die Apokryphen sind fromme Judenbücher, meist entstanden in der Zeit zwischen dem letzten Propheten und der Geburt Christi, etliche noch später. Ihre Verfasser waren keine Propheten und meist unbekannt. Sie kamen daher nicht in allgemeinen Gebrauch. Apokryphisch bedeutet soviel als „nicht kanonisch." In diesem Sinn hat die protestantische Kirche das Wort auch immer verstanden. Es sind die Bücher der griechischen und lateinischen Bibel, welche im hebräischen Kanon nicht enthalten waren. Wann der hebräische Kanon seinen Abschluß fand, kann man nicht sagen; aber nach Josephus hatte er im ersten Jahrhundert nach Christo seinen jetzigen Umfang. Anders stand es bei den hellenischen Juden. Der griechische Kanon nahm eine Menge Schriften auf, die im hebräischen sich nicht finden. Den hellenischen Juden fehlte der strenge Begriff eines Kanons und die apokryphischen Bücher kamen in die griechische Bibel — die Septuaginta.

Nun war die griechische Bibel auch bei den Christen im Gebrauch, und die meisten neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller benutzen bei ihren Zitaten die Septuaginta, aber nie wird ausdrücklich eine Stelle aus unsren Apokryphen angeführt. Freilich werden auch Hohelied, Prediger, Esther, Esra und Nehemia niemals zitiert. Selten die historischen Bücher; doch glaubt man, daß im Brief des Jakobus der Einfluß des Sirach zu spüren sei. Auf jedem Fall hat der Hebräerbrief aus einem Makkabäerbuch genommen, was er Kapitel 11, am Schluß geschrieben hat.

Bei den Kirchenvätern waren die Apokryphen von alters her im Gebrauch. Schuerer nennt Irenäus, Tertullian, Cyprian und andre, und meint, die Kirche der ersten Jahrhunderte habe keinen wesentlichen Unterschied gemacht zwischen dem hebräischen Kanon und den Apokryphen. Der große Origenes ließ aber nur den hebräischen Kanon gelten. Er hat freilich auch die Apokryphen zitiert, so wie wir unsre Dichter und Philosophen zitieren, womit wir sie aber den Propheten und Aposteln nicht gleichsetzen. Nur einer war entschieden gegen die Apokryphen — das war Hieronymus.

„Zur Erbauung könne man wohl die Weisheit Salomos und den Sirach benutzen, nur nicht als Autoritäten," sagt Hieronymus. Im Abendland war die Stimmung den Apokryphen günstig, und unter Augustins Einfluß haben die Synoden zu Hippo (393) und

Carthago (397) die Apokryphen in den Kanon aufgenommen. So blieb es bis zur Reformation, obgleich es an Opposition im Sinn der Hieronymus nicht fehlte. Für die römische Kirche kam die Frage zum Abschluß auf dem Tridentinum (1546). Die Apokryphen wurden in den Kanon aufgenommen. Auch in der griechischen Kirche des Mittelalters wurden die Apokryphen wie die kanonischen Bücher gelesen.

In der protestantischen Kirche war es zuerst Karlstadt, der gegen die Geltung der Apokryphen sich aussprach. Er stellte sich ganz auf die Seite des Hieronymus. Er fand wenig Zustimmung. Luther hat die Apokryphen auch übersetzt und seiner Bibel als Anhang mitgegeben mit der vernünftigen Bemerkung: „Das sind Bücher, so nicht mehr der heiligen Schrift gleichgehalten und doch nützlich und gut zu lesen sind." In der reformierten Kirche galt dieselbe Meinung wie in der lutherischen, doch wurde der Unterschied zwischen kanonischen und nichtkanonischen schärfer betont. Darüber entstand 1851 auch in Deutschland ein Streit: der reformierte Theologe Ebrard, Keerl und andre, waren dagegen; Hengstenberg, Stier und andre waren **für** Aufnahme der Apokryphen in die Bibel. Von England aus hat sich vor hundert Jahren eine lebhafte Agitation für Entfernung der Apokryphen von der Bibel erhoben; und 1825 beschloß die Britische und Ausländische Bibelgesellschaft keine kontinentale Bibelgesellschaft weiter zu unterstützen, welche der Bibel die Apokryphen mitgeben. Die Norwegische Gesellschaft ließ sich das nicht sagen und verlor die englische Unterstützung. Die Folge war, daß jene Gesellschaft ihre Existenzfähigkeit beinahe verlor.

Was soll ich nun sagen über den religiösen und moralischen Wert der Apokryphen? Wenn Luther sagt: sie seien nützlich und gut zu lesen, so gilt das nur von den besten derselben. Es gibt darunter elende Machwerke, schofle Erfindungen mit fingierten Wundergeschichten, daß man sich nur wundern muß, daß ein Augustin mit seinen Synoden, daß eine so vornehme Versammlung von Kirchenfürsten wie die zu Trident, solche Machwerke für göttlich erklären konnten. Man wollte dieses Verfahren noch entschuldigen, wenn man die Ehre der Sanktifikation nur den besten erwiesen hätte. Zu diesen gehören die Weisheit Salomos, der Sirach, das erste Makkabäerbuch und der Baruch.

Die Apokryphen sind freilich keine Prophetenbücher. Ihre Verfasser hatten keine göttlichen Offenbarungen und waren nicht inspiriert. Es gibt aber auch im Kanon nicht inspirierte Bücher. Esra war ein gelehrter und frommer Priester, ein ehrwürdiger Mann, der dem verwahrlosten Volk zum Segen geworden ist. Er war aber kein Prophet, hatte keine Offenbarungen und war nicht

inspiriert. Sein Buch ist aber doch eine wertvolle Beschreibung der Zustände, in welcher die „Kinder des Exils" sich damals befanden. Esras Zeitgenosse und Mitarbeiter Nehemia war auch kein Prophet mit Offenbarungen; er war ein frommer Jude und ein Staatsmann mit seltenem Verstand und ungewöhnlicher Energie. Seine Zeit und sein Vermögen hat er eingesetzt, dem hilflosen Volk eine gesicherte Existenz zu verschaffen, aber sein Buch ist keine inspirierte Schrift.

Was das Esterbuch erzählt, mag ja wahre Geschichte sein, aber von Offenbarungen ist nichts darin. Dasselbe gilt auch von dem feinen Hohelied und erst recht von dem Prediger Salomos. Dieses Buch enthält manch schönes Wort, aber auch viel Unsinn. In Missouri wollte mir ein Adventistenprediger beweisen, daß der gestorbene Mensch ganz tot sei, maustot, und erst in ferner Zukunft mache Gott etwas lebendig, das als Substitut für den einstigen Menschen gelte und empfange, was der Mensch im Leben verdient habe. Diese Lehre wollte er mir aus dem Prediger Salomo beweisen. Ich sagte ihm, aus diesem Buch nehmen wir keine Glaubenssätze, sondern aus den Evangelien, den Episteln der Aposteln und den Propheten. Schon das eine Gleichnis vom reichen Mann und dem armen Lazarus vernichte seine Lehre, denn die beiden waren nach ihrem Sterben nicht maustot, sondern lebten noch, und an verschiedenen Orten und in verschiedenen Zuständen.

So nehmen wir keine Lehrsätze aus den Apokryphen, wenn auch etliche nützlich und gut zu lesen sind. Schon vom ersten Buch derselben, vom Buch der Judith, gilt das günstige Urteil durchaus nicht. Das Buch hat keinen historischen Wert — es ist die reine Erfindung. Es hat auch keinen sittlichen Wert — es ist anstößig. Der assyrische Feldherr Holofernes belagerte die Judenstadt Bethulia und bringt sie durch Abschneiden des Wassers in die höchste Not. Da faßte Judith, eine Witwe, den Plan zu helfen: „Mit dem Herrn fang alles an," hieß es bei ihr, und sie betet ergreifend schön und fromm (Kap. 9). Danach fand sie Zutritt zu Holofernes und berückt ihn durch ihre Schönheit und Klugheit. Sie war mit ihm allein zusammen in der Nacht und mit viel Gebet hieb sie ihm, dem betrunkenen Feldherrn den Kopf ab. Glücklich entkam sie und wurde von ihren Volksgenossen verherrlicht, nachdem sie die Assyrer geschlagen hatten. Das Buch ist eine historische Fiktion zum Zweck der Ermutigung des Volkes zum Kampf um seinen Glauben in der Makkabäerzeit. Unangenehm berührt der Mißbrauch des Namens Gottes und verwerflich der Grundsatz: Zu einem guten Zweck ist jedes Mittel erlaubt, auch der Meuchelmord.

2. Das Buch der Weisheit. Der Verfasser war ein jüdischer Philosoph, der die jüdische Frömmigkeit mit der griechischen Philosophie zu verbinden suchte. Schon im Alten Testament wird an einigen Stellen die Weisheit als das höchste Gut, als der Inbegriff aller Tugenden betrachtet. Vor allem war die Erkenntnis Gottes und die Gottesfurcht dazu gerechnet. Weisheit und Frömmigkeit war identisch **und der Weise war der Gerechte.** Darum verleiht die Weisheit nicht nur Ehre und Ruhm, sondern auch ewiges Leben und Seligkeit. Das vermag sie, weil sie aus Gott ist, und ihr Handeln mit dem Handeln Gottes identisch. Dieses Buch ist in der Tat nützlich und gut zu lesen, es ist erbaulich, weil Glauben stärkend. Mit großem Ernst redet er vom künftigen Gericht und der gerechten Vergeltung. Da heißt es auch: „Wehe den Gottlosen!" — „Aber die Gerechten leben in Ewigkeit; sie haben ihren Lohn im Herrn, und die Sorge für sie steht beim Höchsten. Darum werden sie das Reich der Herrlichkeit und die Krone der Schönheit aus der Hand des Herrn empfangen; denn mit seiner Rechten wird er sie beschützen und mit seinem Arm sie beschirmen." Kap. 5, 1—16. Das ist recht biblisch, ja fast neutestamentlich geredet, aber man vergesse nicht, daß der Mann nicht aus Offenbarung geredet hat, und in seine recht vernünftigen Betrachtungen hat auch die Phantasie hineingeredet. Darum: „Prüfet alles und das Gute behaltet." Auf eine weitere Angabe des Inhalts muß ich verzichten.

3. Tobit und Tobias. Dieses Büchlein gehört zum Schönsten, Frömmsten und Besten der Apokryphen. Es ist eine anmutige Dichtung, wohl mit historischem Grund. Der Zweck war: zu zeigen, daß Gott die Frommen und die Gerechten niemals zu Schanden werden läßt, sondern sich ihrer immer wieder annimmt, wenn es auch je und dann scheine, als ob Gott sich nicht um sie kümmere. Darum sollten sie Gott treu bleiben auch unter den Heiden und ihr Vertrauen ihm bewahren. Das ist ja im Glauben gesprochen und man sieht, daß es damals unter den zerstreuten Israeliten fromme Leute gab, die im Glauben an Gott festblieben. Die politischen Angaben sind richtig.

1. Die Weisheit Jesu, des Sohnes Sirachs. Dieses Buch wurde ursprünglich hebräisch geschrieben und vom Enkel des Verfassers ins Griechische übersetzt. In einem Vorwort schreibt der Uebersetzer: „Weil uns Vieles und Wichtiges durch das Gesetz und die Propheten und die andern Männer, die sich an sie angeschlossen haben, mitgeteilt worden ist, wofür Israel das Lob der Gesittung und Weisheit verdient; und weil es nützlich scheint auch den Laien durch Wort und Schrift zu dienen, so hat mein Großvater Jesus, nachdem er sich dem Studium des Gesetzes, der Propheten und der

übrigen von unsren Voreltern uns überlieferten Schriften mit besonderm Eifer gewidmet und sich eine anerkennenswerte Tüchtigkeit in ihnen erworben hatte, schließlich dazu getrieben fühlte, auch selbst ein auf Gesittung und Weisheit bezügliches Werk abzufassen, damit die Lernbegierigen eine viel stärkere Förderung durch einem dem Gesetz entsprechenden Lebenswandel erführen." Die Uebersetzung geschah im 38. Regierungsjahr des Königs Euergetes, also im Jahre 132 vor Christo, denn Euergetes regierte in Aegypten von 170 bis 117 vor Christo. So mag denn das Original des Buches zwischen 170 und 190 vor Christo entstanden sein. Es gibt auch eine lateinische Uebersetzung, die sehr wenig mit der griechischen stimmt. Mit den Uebersetzungen ist es ein übel Ding. Die Bibel hat horrible Varianten bekommen auf dem Missionsgebiet durch ungeschickte Uebersetzer. Luther hat den Sirach auch übersetzt, aber es sei mehr eine Bearbeitung als eine Uebersetzung, sagt Schnerer. Es gibt auch einen hebräischen Sirach, und den hat Dr. Menge zu Rate gezogen, wenn ihm das Griechische nicht deutlich genug schien. Das Sirachbuch ist das Spruchbuch der praktischen Lebensweisheit ähnlich dem Spruchbuch Salomos. Es gibt im menschlichen Leben kein Verhältnis, worauf das Buch nicht einging. Der Verfasser hat für alles Ratschläge und Zurechtweisungen. Er spricht von Gottesfurcht und göttlicher Weisheit, von Freundschaft und Barmherzigkeit, von Selbstbeherrschung und Mäßigkeit, kurzum: von allem, was ein Lob und eine Tugend oder eine Untugend ist. Es ist eine ausführliche jüdische Ethik, vielmehr Kasuistik. Dabei ist er kein Pharisäer, kein Sauertopf und Griesgram, sondern ein menschenfreundlicher Mann, in dessen Umgang man behaglich fühlt. Es ist gesetzlich fromme jüdische Moral, aber Christen können davon auch etwas lernen.

5. Das erste Buch der Makkabäer. Der historische Wert des Buches ist unanfechtbar. Es ist eine Beschreibung der Bedrängnisse, welche die Juden im zweiten Jahrhundert vor Christo von Seiten der syrischen Könige, besonders von Antiochus Epiphanes, erlitten haben, und eine Schilderung der Heldentaten, welche die Juden unter Judas Makkabäus und seinen Brüdern verrichtet haben. Es galt die Rettung des Gottesdienstes und des Judentums selbst. Der König hatte den Altar und Tempel schmählich entweiht, den Gottesdienst unterdrückt und wollte die Juden in Heiden verwandeln, oder ausrotten. Da wagte der Priester Mattathias den Widerstand und seine Söhne, vor allen Judas, führten den Krieg. Sie fielen alle, aber das Heiligtum und die jüdische Unabhängigkeit war gerettet. „Makabi" heißt Hammer, und davon bekamen diese Helden den Namen „Makkabäer." Sie heißen auch „Hasmonäer," d. h. edle Männer, vornehme Leute. Das Buch

erzählt die Geschichte von 175 bis 135 vor Christo. Der Name des Verfassers ist unbekannt. Ursprünglich war es hebräisch geschrieben. Das sagen Origenes und Hieronymus.

6. Das zweite Makkabärbuch geht seinem Inhalt nach mit dem ersten parallel, aber so, daß es etwas früher einsetzt und bedeutend früher als das erste schließt. Der Verfasser schrieb nicht aus eigener Anschauung und Erfahrung, sondern schöpfte aus dem Buch eines gewissen Jason von Crene, von dem man sonst nichts weiß, sowie aus mündlichen Ueberlieferungen. Es waren trübe Quellen. Darum steht es dem ersten Buch an Glaubwürdigkeit nach. Es erzählt dieselben Ereignisse zum Teil anders und in andrer Ordnung als das erste. Erdichtete Sagen sind auch mit eingeschlossen. Schon die zwei Sendschreiben an die Juden in Aegypten sind Fiktionen, sagt Hengstenberg. Dabei werden Wunder berichtet, darunter ein recht „wunderliches" Wunder. Bei der Wegführung des Volkes nach Babel sollen die Priester vom heiligen Feuer mitgenommen und dort in einer leeren Cysterne gut versteckt haben. Nehemia ließ es holen. Man fand aber kein Feuer, sondern schlammiges Wasser. Man bringt davon nach Jerusalem, gießt es auf das Opfer und die hellen Flammen lodern auf. 2. Mak. K. 1. Zu bemerken ist, daß von der Zeit an, da Gottes Bund mit Israel gebrochen war, noch vor der Zerstörung Jerusalems, keine Wunder mehr geschahen. Auch nicht zur Zeit Jeremias und der Propheten nach ihm. Es sei nicht ganz richtig dergleichen Berichte als **Lügen** zu bezeichnen; der Verfasser wollte ja Wahrheit und Dichtung geben, sagt Hengstenberg und nennt das Buch einen **Roman** der Makkabäerzeit. Der Verfasser wollte zum Vergnügen schreiben. Das ist ihm auch gelungen mit seinem geistreichen Buch. Der Verfasser dieses Buches hat mehr religiöses Interesse als der Verfasser des ersten Buchs. Er will nicht nur die Taten einer ruhmreichen Vergangenheit berichten, sondern auf die Gegenwart in religiöser Beziehung einwirken und fügt erbauliche Betrachtung ein. Im Ganzen bleibt die historische Grundlage unverletzt und die Scheidung von Wahrheit und Dichtung ist nicht schwer, sagt Hengstenberg und bemerkt, daß das Buch spät entstanden sei, da Philo und Josephus nichts davon wußten.

7. Das Buch Baruch ist späteren Ursprungs und nicht vor dem Zeitgenossen Jeremias. Es führt eine ernste Sprache und redet im Sinn und Ton des Propheten. Insofern ist es von theologischem Wert und anregend.

Es gibt noch andre apokryphische Bücher.

1. Der apokryphische Esra, eine ziemlich wertlose Kompilation, sagt Schnerer. Die Hauptmasse ist mit dem kanonischen Esra identisch.

2. Zusätze zum Buch Esther mit etwas apokalyptischem Charakter.

3. Zusätze zu Daniel. a. Gebete des Asaria und Lobgesang der drei Jünglinge im Feuerofen auf Grund von Daniel Kap. 3.

b. Die Geschichte der Susanna von Babel, und

c. Die beiden Anekdoten vom Bel und Drachen zu Babel. Alles Erfindungen zu Ehren des Propheten Daniels. Dichtungen sind auch das Gebet Manasses und der Brief des Jeremias.

Schlußwort. Die Apokryphen sind immerhin ein wertvoller Besitz. Von historischer Bedeutung sind freilich nur die Makkabäerbücher. Aber ohne dieselben wüßte man wenig von den Erlebnissen der Juden unter den syrischen Königen. Die Griechen und Römer befaßten sich wenig mit den Juden: sie waren ihnen zu unbedeutend. Vor Alexander hat kein griechischer Schriftsteller den Namen der Juden genannt. Herodot führt sie nur als Syrer in Palestina an und hat sehr unklare Vorstellungen von ihnen. Josephus wäre faßt die einzige Quelle der Geschichte der Juden zwischen Nehemia und Christus. Inbezug auf Kultur und Religion der Juden jener Zeit geben die Apokryphen genauen Bericht. Die Juden waren den gebildeten Griechen ebenbürtig; sie hatten ihre Schriftsteller und Philosophen und waren kein verkommenes Sklavenvolk. In Sachen der Religion standen sie einzig da, wie ihre Vorfahren von Mose an. Der Kern des Volkes war fromm und hielt fest am Gesetz des Herrn, sodaß sie auch dafür zu leiden bereit waren.

EDITORIALS

WHAT KIND OF REFORMATION SERMON?

When this number is going to be read we may be writing our Reformation sermon. This sermon should meet a number of requirements. It should—to mention only one—be adapted to the times. Some years ago we heard a reformation sermon by a man whom we had called from a neighboring city, a successful pastor and a speaker of no mean repute. He preached a sermon in which he brought out an important law which seems to hold good in God's kingdom, and applied it to the Reformation movement. The sermon was good as far as it went, but it failed entirely in not connecting up with present times and needs. It stayed in the past and forgot the 20th century while speaking of the 16th.

And this writer himself made perhaps a greater blunder—at least in the opinion of some of his hearers—when several years ago he decided to do thorough work in the Reformation season. He spoke of the times and the life of Luther at length, and then of the position of the bible in the Protestant church and of the sola fide. He thought he had done pretty well but, much later, he learned that some of his young people had rather been bored by his historical references and considered most of his efforts, during those two or three Sundays, a waste of time.

This lack of appreciation was very annoying. Still, now—after time has cooled pastoral sensibilities—we are willing to concede that some of the criticism may have been just. Reformation Day is the day that has found less of place and consideration in American Protestantism than any other, and to our young people Luther and the other Reformers are persons they know little about and care less. Our efforts to remedy this defect, in the pulpit, meet with little sympathy, as my experience showed. Therefore it seems better to strive more for timeliness in this matter than for historical enlightenment.

Timeliness is one of the chief requirements in all sermons. Our text may deal with Jews, Greeks or Romans, but we must make a way quickly to get to the Americans that are sitting before us. The bible scene may be laid in Jerusalem or Corinth or Ephesus; our hearers are more interested in the American landscape or in the city where they live. What are their problems today, what are their needs, trials, aspirations and how can we serve them along these lines—this ought to be the preacher's task.

Luther lived in an age that made much of church and church going and of the sacramental element of religion. He, therefore, had to show that church going alone won't save. To-day church going is not overstressed. More than 70 millions of Americans never go to church. So it would be carrying coal to Newcastle to tell the people of our time not to overemphasize church going. Luther, in his search after truth, found himself blocked every time by the authority of church and pope. He had to throw off the shackles of ecclesiastic tyranny. He put the bible in the place of church and pope. To-day—while the Roman church is still strong and imposing—Protestants are released from it. Religious freedom is the heritage of every one. We find other adversaries in the way. Is the bible really the last seat of authority, so we hear them ask everywhere. And the answer of the age is: Not the bible is the last resort. The last and decisive word has to be spoken by *Science*. So it's clear that in our Reformation sermon—and elsewhere—we have to enlighten the people, if we can on this dilemma and show up the function of faith and science and in what sense the bible still speaks with the voice of authority.

Luther's message was largely—not altogether—the individual gospel of salvation by faith. Our time is the age of the social gospel: not the individual only, but the social order is to be made subject to the spirit of Christ. Luther preached obedience to the powers that be and submission to the evils of this vale of sorrow. The social gospel demands active virtues also. The age is ruled by the law of progress, the world is to be made better. Now whether these are fallacies, half truths or real truths—such is the mental situation today. And Reformation sermons ought to do justice to it. While they link us with an important past, they ought to try, from bible, history and present experience, to give an answer to questions that are in the air and that demand sensible discussion from those who are the religious teachers of the race.

OUR SYNOD AND THE SOCIAL GOSPEL

Ten, fifteen years ago most people in our Synod hardly knew what "Social Gospel" meant. It was just as foreign to us as it is to most Lutheran bodies today. Our Christian faith had to do with the salvation of the individual. The Kingdom of God, this fundamental conception in the religious thought of the day, was to come by divine intervention, at the end of this aeon, and man could do nothing but pray for its coming. We showed in our "Geschichte des religioesen Lebens" that in 1917, at the General Conference of Pittsburgh, the Commission for Social Service submitted its first report and that in it occurred the momentous state-

ment, that the whole of Christ's work finds its expression in the term "the Kingdom of God." In looking back we can realize the significance of this statement. The Social Gospel found official entrance into the work and thought of our Church at that time, and brother Horstmann was its first spokesman and became its most consistent and valiant protagonist.

Since then things have moved considerably. Think only of Professor H. R. Niebuhr's recent book, "The Social Causes of Denominationalism" and its thesis that "the causes of schism have always been dominantly sociological rather than theological." We had thought that the different churches owed their origin and character to the nature of their religious experience. He says, no: rather to their economic status and to their racial and national organizations.

And great is the number of the younger clergy who are enamored with the new viewpoint and try to unveil before their congregations the long forgotten aspects of the Kingdom idea. In many cases the people don't readily understand them. They wonder e. g. why the preacher speaks so much about the abolition of war. Only lately war was God's way to bring in everlasting peace and now it is the greatest collective sin of the age. Again, they often get the impression that their minister is a veritable socialist. He belabors the capitalists and pleads the cause of the common people. If they are not employers of labor they like it but they doubt whether it will ever change conditions much.

Then there are also many who miss the note of personal piety, the emphasis on conversion, the emotional appeal, the culture of the inner life. The sermon seems to deal more with externals; conditions and environment are to be changed. Still, is not a change of heart and a living, manly faith more important? Take the last two devotional books put out by the Synod, the "Hausaltar" (edited by W. Baur) and the "Christian Family Altar" (reflecting the characteristics of the late Professor Vollmer), and you see at once the striking change in tone and treatment). Baur's book is the kind we were used to, Vollmer's lacks the Pietistic unction.

The greatest objection the old-time Evangelical makes to the Social-Gospel man is that he is a Liberal, a Modernist. His theology is not sound; at any rate, it is not the "faith of our fathers." The social preachers admit that readily. Rauschenbusch was so convinced of it that he even tried to furnish a more adequate theology for the modern man in his "A New Theology for the Social Gospel." This God was to be a Democrat, not an absolute King. He didn't worry about the two natures in Christ, or about his miracles. The atonement meant that Christ had to suffer the con-

sequences of the collective sins of the age; but his death was not a ransom for human guilt. It was caused by sin and it showed the glory of his character (faith in God and love for man). In Christ's second coming we are not interested; we are interested, however, in the growing establishment of his rule on earth. Other social preachers have gone farther in their negation than Rauschenbusch. They are all Liberals. Creeds and doctrines are for them only codifications of the faith of a certain age. Coming ages are bound to shed the opinions of the past as the growing child discards his swaddling clothes.

Our Synod is ready to accept what is true in this standpoint. At the same time, it will not let vital elements of the Christian faith be sacrificed. The future only can show how the conservatism of the past can enter into union with the progressiveness of the new time.

R. D. No. 3, Randolph, Vt., August 6, 1930.

Rev. H. Kamphausen
9807 Cudell Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio

My dear Rev. Kamphausen:

I have just read the editorial "She Gives Him Five Years" in the July issue of the *Theological Magazine*. I note that it contains one of your periodic "slams" at Dr. Fosdick. (I take "E. Fosdick" as a printer's slip for the name of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick.) That is, of course, a matter of individual taste and temperament; and I cannot well criticize either you or the lady in question for your opinion of him.

I do, however, object to the misstatement of fact in your next paragraph, which says: "He is not a pastor now, visits no one, doesn't shepherd the souls, is neither at the sick-bed nor at dying moments." This statement is absolutely unwarranted and badly unjust. No doubt, in a parish the size of his, he doesn't get an opportunity to visit or even to know everyone. Possibly his associates do not call on everyone regularly. But with all of his work of preaching, writing, and teaching at Union Theological Seminary, with frequent lecture and speaking engagements elsewhere in addition, Dr. Fosdick nevertheless insists on finding time each week for a certain amount of personal pastoral work. He is so trusted a "shepherd of souls" that men and women with serious difficulties write him from all over the country for help, and often travel long distances to talk with him. His sermons contain abundant material from his personal contacts, and he frequently tells of his sick-

bed experiences. I should appreciate your making the necessary correction.

May I take this opportunity of assuring you that in as unpoetic a setting as a homiletics class one does get "touched" spiritually—if that adverb has any connection with the noun "spirit." And may I remind you that capable critics accept his addresses as sermons.—As for "reconciling science and religion," Dr. Fosdick would probably enjoy that verb. But whatever sacrifices are necessary have to be made, not by "religion," but by theology—which really isn't a very bad idea—or at most by some types of religion. So far as I can see, "the master Modernist"—as you call him although he would probably recognize a different Master—has never thrown over any religious value but that he has found a better wherewith to replace it. And even a fundamentalist must admit that Jesus got along pretty well without the guidance of Luther.

Sincerely yours,

Huber F. Klemme.

The critic overlooked that I was publishing the lady's opinion, not my own. *Editor.*

"DE SENECTUTE"*

Sechzig Jahr — geht's Alter an, so heißt es in einem deutschen Spruch. So hielt es schon Cicero. Er hatte schon über manches Thema geschrieben, aber als er 62 war, fühlte er, daß das Alter herangekommen war. Was für eine Frage konnte natürlicher sein, als die nach einem glücklichen Alter. Dieser Frage ist das Schriftchen, das oben im Titel angegeben ist, geweiht. Er widmet es seinem jungen Freund Atticus und legt seine Gedanken dem alten, vierundachtzigjährigen Cato (dem bekannten Feind Karthagos, der Nebenbuhlerin Roms) in den Mund. Aber er schrieb es eigentlich für sich selbst und für alle, die an der Grenze des Alters stehen. Es ist also eine passende Lektüre für viele unsrer deutschen Leser. Wir lernen nicht bloß von Paulus und Petrus, oder von Luther und Wesley. Der Apostel sagt: Ob Paulus, oder Apollo, oder Kephas, oder **die Welt**: es ist alles euer! Cicero war nicht bloß ein Redner und Advokat, er war auch ein Philosoph, ein Lehrer der Lebenskunst. Er hatte ein bewegtes Leben hinter sich, sich versucht in manchen Stellungen und stets sich bemüht, nach bestem Wissen und Gewissen zu handeln. Er hatte nicht die unbeugsame Charakterfestigkeit des Cato, aber auch nicht dessen fanatische Härte. Was auch immer seine Schwächen gewesen sein mögen, im

* Ciceros Werk über „Das Alter." — Editor.

ganzen haben wir in ihm das Bild eines reich begabten, edlen Menschen, der nicht nur in der Literatur, sondern auch als Persönlichkeit einen weltweiten Einfluß ausgeübt hat.

Um kurz auf seine Schrift über das Alter einzugehen: Er gesteht zu, daß das Alter manche Gebrechen und Hindernisse uns in den Weg legt, aber daß es auch manche Vorzüge hat; daß es von manchen Illusionen befreit und den Blick auf das Wesentliche, das Bleibende, das Innerliche richtet. Von seinen Gedanken interessiert uns wohl am meisten nicht seine nüchterne Lebensweisheit, sondern sein religiöser Glaube. Das Alter ist nicht fern vom Ende, vom Tod. Ja wohl, erwidert er, aber ist denn der Tod so sehr zu fürchten? Ist er das Ende aller Dinge? Dieser Frage widmet er einen großen Teil seines Argumentes, und auf Plato, dem tiefsten griechischen Denker fußend, entwickelt er seinen Glauben an das Jenseits. Die Seele, die so großes im Menschenleben schafft und leistet, kann nicht dem Tod verfallen. Ihr gehört Unsterblichkeit. Wer weise und gut gelebt hat, geht beim Tod ein in ein besseres Leben, vereint mit seinen Lieben und all den großen Geistern, die je der Menschheit gedient haben. Die Wahrheit dieses Glaubens mag nicht absolut erweisbar sein. Sie ist aber das, worauf das Denken und Hoffen der Besten hindeutet. Sollte das nicht genugsam sein? Wenn dann das Alter uns dieser Zukunft näher führt, warum sollte es so sehr zu fürchten sein?

So weit führt Reflektion und Philosophie den Cicero, so weit und nicht weiter. Auch heute ist sie noch nicht darüber hinausgekommen. Nur der Glaube lichtet den Vorhang, und nur der christliche Glaube gibt volle Gewißheit.

Was Ciceros Anweisungen zu einem glücklichen Alter anbelangt, so kann der Leser davon nur profitieren, zumal Cicero sie immer an bekannten Persönlichkeiten illustriert. Natürlich halten sie nicht immer Stich. Wenn er z. B. dem Alternden Rückkehr ins Landleben empfiehlt, wer kann das durchführen? Auch gelten seine Ratschläge meist bloß für gebildete Leute, und sie sind ganz aufs Individuelle zugeschnitten. Niemals denkt der Schriftsteller auch nur entfernt an die soziale Seite der Frage. Moderne Gedankengänge wie dieser: Was sollen wir mit unsern Alten tun? bleiben der Erwägung ferne. Das schwere Problem unsers industriellen Zeitalters, die Fürsorge für die, welche den Schnellschritt des wirtschaftlichen Lebens nicht mehr mitmachen können, berührt Cicero nicht.

Seine Schrift, wie sein ganzes literarisches Vermächtnis ist ja auch in den Händen der Arbeitswelt (ob Herren oder Angestellte) nicht zu finden. Schreiber dieses hat selbst sich dieser Lektüre erst zugewandt, als auch für ihn die Zeit kam, an die vor zwei Jahr-

tausenden Cicero durch seine 62 Jahre erinnert wurde und hat wohl die Verschiedenheit der Gesichtspunkte von damals und heute gespürt. Wer würde heute über das Alter schreiben ohne eine stark soziale Note?

Daß der heidnische Philosoph auch religiös in seinem Argument nicht befriedigt, liegt auf der Hand. Er sagt richtig: Eine wohl verbrachte Jugend ist der sicherste Weg zu einem glücklichen Alter. Aber er kennt nicht das Gebet des Psalmisten: „Herr, gedenke nicht der Sünden meiner Jugend!" oder das andre: „Sei gnädig meiner Missetat, die da groß ist!" Er kennt nicht den Gebetsverkehr mit dem göttlichen Herrn, noch den Gnadenweg in Buße und Glaube, den uns der gute Hirte auftut.

Noch manches wäre in dieser Richtung hinzuzufügen, wo Cicero versagt und ein Größerer nötig ist. Die ganze Art, wie Christus und seine Apostel zur Geduld und Freudigkeit gegenüber den Uebeln des Lebens ermahnen, ist religiös fundiert. Man denke an Paulus in Röm. 8: „Der uns seinen Sohn gegeben, wird er uns mit ihm nicht alles schenken?" Auch im Alten Testament: „Wenn sie gleich alt werden, werden sie doch **in den Vorhöfen Gottes** grünen."

Doch wozu Unmögliches fordern? Die Lektüre dieses alten Schriftchens sei bestens empfohlen. Wer es in guter Uebersetzung aufmerksam liest, wird vielleicht dem alten Heiden im Geist die Hand drücken und sagen: „Das hast du gut gemacht! Und wenn du dem Alter so viele gute Seiten abgewinnst, sollte ich es nicht noch mehr tun?"

The Christian World

Dr. Jefferson Ends Thirty-three Years' Ministry With Unusual Record

By Linley V. Gordon

When the Rev. Charles E. Jefferson arrived in New York thirty-three years ago, he was warned that Broadway Tabernacle, of which he was the new pastor, was the Matterhorn of New York. There were reasons for this opinion. No one seemed to like the Congregational Church. Manhattan, it would seem, has been the graveyard of Congregational churches—more than forty had been started, struggled and died. Dr. Jefferson has himself said that Congregationalism in New York has always been an alien and an exotic.

Moreover, Broadway Tabernacle is a downtown church and downtown churches are notorious because of the difficulties they present. Again, Broadway is the street of theatres and cabarets. All these things helped to make the church seem the Matterhorn of New York.

Dr. Jefferson proceeded to scale this mountain by studying closely and at length both his church and city. For three years in addition to his preaching he devoted himself, as he expressed it, to "constant observation and painstaking, incessant study."

To-day Dr. Jefferson preaches his farewell sermon in the church which is the fruit of that study and observation, one of the most truly popular and effective churches in the city. On Aug. 29, his seventieth birthday, he will officially retire from his pastorate, although remaining pastor emeritus.

Realizes Dream for New Building

It was in the early years of his ministry in New York that a new church was built for his congregation. For years he had dreamed about a building fully equipped to meet the tasks being ushered in by the new day. It must be so situated and so planned that it must last for a long time. It must have a capacious auditorium, a majestic pulpit, chancel, choir stalls, lecture halls, Bible school auditorium, class rooms, galleries, club rooms, offices, studios for the pastor and his secretaries, library, reception rooms and a complete housekeeping apartment. And above all it must possess perfect acoustics, for, he said:

"Better a barn in which a preacher can be heard than a Cathedral in which worshippers strain their ears to catch a voice which fain would give them instruction or consolation."

This was the sort of equipment of which he dreamed and in the present building on Broadway and 56th Street it came into being.

The Tabernacle as it stands to-day was largely his conception. It was the first skyscraper church in Manhattan.

But spiritual Matterhorns are not scaled by architectural and mechanical devices.

The first peak Dr. Jefferson had to scale was the old conception of the Bible. A generation ago there were murmurings about the new theology. No one seemed to know what it was and most of those who had heard of it sneered at it. Those who used the word "new" did it with biting intonation, like the snap of a dog. Others were confused. They had been brought up to believe in an infallible Bible. And now there were German and English and American scholars who dared to question the mechanical theory of inspiration.

Takes Stand for Higher Criticism

The new view was not by any means domesticated in the Broadway Tabernacle when Dr. Jefferson came and in a series of thirteen lectures, each lecture an hour in length, he cast aside the traditional and orthodox view of the Bible and took his stand by the side of the Higher Critics, saying:

"The Bible can never escape from the reason. If at any time in the future any book of the sixty-six books that make up the big book should become offensive to the enlightened reason of the church, it would simply be cast out. No Bible, book or Christian doctrine will be carried along permanently which is offensive to the highest reason of Christian men."

Early in his career he began a fight against militarism. He had traveled all over Europe and has become conscious of the problem as it existed there. He returned determined to strike the accursed thing. He was one of the first men in the ministry of the United States to get his eyes on it. For thirty years and more he has tried to remove it.

In sermons and lectures and books and magazine articles he has poured his vial of wrath on militarism. It is becoming the vogue now to denounce militarism, but when he did it advocates of peace were referred to as pusillanimous creatures, or piffling pacifists, or sad-eyed doves.

Dr. Jefferson is a many-sided man. One soon discovers that by his preaching and his writings. One could not reign for thirty-three years on the ecclesiastical throne of Broadway if he were monotonous. But he has employed no trick methods. He has never been spectacular —never a showman. Never has he used a bass drum. He is a living example of the fact that it is possible in the twentieth century, in the United States, in hectic New York and on theatrical Broadway, for a minister of the Gospel to do a significant work by means of quiet preaching, efficient administration and deep living.

He has borne testimony to the effect that one can succeed on Manhattan Island without "whooping it up." He has scorned the meretricious. He has repudiated vulgar methods of church advertising. In all his ministry he has never used sensational subjects. He has performed a high task on Broadway, but he has never been his-

trionic. Through all these years it has not been possible for time or custom to stale his infinite variety.

When an editor of a New York daily wrote of him on his thirtieth anniversary as minister of the Broadway Tabernacle, in thinking of his life and work, his preaching and his example of patience, courage, industry, sacrifice and love, the most appropriate title he could confer upon him was "Saint of the Great White Way."

China Today

By the Rev. Edmund L. Souder
Episcopal Missionary, Diocese of Hankow

For the past month China news has frequently been front-page material in the newspapers. The looting and burning of the great city of Changsha by Communist troops, accompanied by the slaughter of several hundred people, and the wilful destruction of much mission property; the evacuation of many foreigners from Kuling, the Central China summer resort, at the urgent request of Chinese and foreign authorities alike; the flight of hundreds of Chinese from Nanchang, Wusih, and other important places—all this, and much more, has come to us in press dispatches. It has an added interest for us as Church people inasmuch as these Communist depredations have centered about Kiangsi, Hupeh, and Hunan provinces, where the American Church has much missionary endeavor. One of our Chinese priests, Fr. Feng, has already been martyred, and a number of others have had hair-breadth escapes.

Perhaps many Church people are in the position of friends of mine, who have recently said to me, "I read the China news, and am interested, but I don't know what it is all about!" The situation in China today, with everything—intellectual, political, economic, social, and religious—in the melting-pot, is far too complex for any one person to "explain" it, even within the compass of a weighty volume, yet it may be worth while to try, in a few words, to indicate what seem to be some of the factors in the present situation, not primarily as political news, but as something that has a direct bearing on the mission work of the American Church in China, which has been built up through the prayers, the gifts, and the labors of devout Church people at home.

It is a fact familiar to many Americans that Dr. Sun Yat Sen, the "father" of China's revolution, worked through forty perilous years to bring about a modern government in ancient China. He was not only baptized in youth in an Anglican mission school, but at his death he was buried by Christian rites, one of the officiating clergy being an American-trained Chinese priest of the Anglican rite. Dr. Sun was no saint, but there is no reason to deny that he was a patriot.

In 1911, largely as a result of his efforts, the Manchu dynasty was overthrown, and a "republic" established, but the country soon came to be divided among a group of utterly self-interested war-lords, who fought back and forth across the land, each trying to enlarge his

territory at the expense of the war-lord nearest him. Dr. Sun then sought to carry forward his uncompleted revolution, and for financial and moral support turned to the Western Powers. He especially hoped for sympathy with his democratic ideals for China in Britain and America. Western commercial interests, however, were not at all desirous of upsetting the *status quo*, whereby the foreigner in China has enjoyed many political and economic privileges, and one by one the Powers disappointed him. In desperation he turned to Russia. An important meeting with Dr. Adolf Joffe, able Russian diplomat, took place in Shanghai in January, 1923, and an *entente cordiale* was formed which marked a turning-point in the Chinese revolution. Russia voluntarily relinquished privileges previously enjoyed under the unilateral, or "unequal" treaties, and at once appeared to the Chinese as their one true friend. Russian military and political advisers came to Canton, the seat of the revolutionary government, and, under Michael Borodin, Chinese nationalism grew in power, and in an incredibly short time during 1927-28, the "people's revolutionary army" drove out one feudal war-lord after another, and the Nationalist flag was flying throughout China, Manchuria included.

The great majority of Chinese Nationalist leaders were not Communist, but they rather naively believed that they could accept Russian aid without any *quid pro quo*. That was not the Russian idea, and ever since China got astride the Russian tiger to ride him to liberty, equality, and fraternity, she has found it increasingly difficult to get off again. Communist propaganda was effectively begun among both farmers and students, and the Sun Yat Sen University for Chinese youths was established in Moscow, in which several thousand boys and girls have since been schooled in the economic philosophy of Marx and Lenine, and the violent methods of Red revolution. Hardly had the Nationalist troops entered the important Central China city of Wuchang, for instance, where the writer along with many others went through a forty day siege, than the walls were placarded with thousands of posters, many of them entirely constructive in sentiment, such as "Reform the city government," "Abolish opium smoking," etc., but there were also others, such as these: "Marx was the father of the oppressed people of the world!" "Unite with Russia against the Imperialists!" and "Recover the spirit of the Paris commune!" which I fear was a bit over the head of the average coolie!

Later, following a period of terrorism in Hunan and the Canton massacre of December, 1927, there was a complete break with Russia, its consulates were closed, and Borodin, chief Russian adviser, had to flee. The moderate, anti-Communist Nationalist group (the Nanking government) came into power. But Communism had not been driven out of China: it was simply driven under ground, and as civil war has dragged on, its propagandists have had an almost free hand in the militarily unprotected country districts. Roving groups of disbanded soldiery, and other bandits, have terrorized ever widening areas, plundering and massacring as they went, and the Communist organizers have made use of them, apparently with the idea of breaking down

all organized government, that out of the ensuing chaos they might build a Soviet world. As these bandit hordes have increased in size they have increased also in boldness, until today they have become veritable Red armies, intelligently led by trained officers, some of whom are graduates of European and American universities, who are genuine converts to the tenets of Red Russia, and they attack now not small villages but large cities, like Changsha.

How shall we, as thoughtful Christians, view these recent happenings in China? Being half way around the world from us are they our concern? They should be, for if four hundred million Chinese eventually become Communist, the Western world will hear from it. Or do we just wax eloquently indignant at such horrors as are taking place? That is perhaps the natural human reaction, but it is not the "scientific" attitude. I shall always feel grateful to a sociologist lecturer who pointed out that when we come on some social philosophy or social organization which is not congenial to our own thought, whether it be individualism or imperialism, capitalism or communism, we should not get angry at it, or call it hard names, but should try rather to study it, investigate it, ask what causes it, etc. In some such objective, scientific way, let us ask why the present situation in China should have developed as it has.

To do this we need to envisage something larger than China, and reflect a little on past world history. An American business man who dropped into a seat beside me on the train recently, said in conversation that he believed people are naturally long-suffering: they will suffer patiently a good many pin-pricks of misfortune and inconvenience. But, he said, when things get absolutely unbearable, the top blows off, and there is a revolution. Our own national life in America began in a revolution against the old mother country. Doubtless the colonies had adequate cause for revolt, though there were many Tories, but I am convinced that the provocation for the American Revolution was not nearly so great as that for the subsequent revolutions in France, in Russia, and, today, in China.

As one re-reads French history of the eighteenth century, or walks about Versailles and tries to reconstruct the picture of the times when millions of francs were spent on gardens and fountains for the enjoyment of the King and his friends while starving peasants cried vainly for bread, he comes to understand, even though he does not approve, the Reign of Terror. "Disease and famine; crushing imposts and extortions, official debasement of the currency, bankruptcy, state prisons, religious and political inquisition; suppression of all institutions for the safeguarding of rights; tyranny by intendants; royal, feudal, and clerical oppression burdening every faculty and necessity of life; monstrous and incurable luxury"—this is the word picture given in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* on conditions in France at the end of Louis XIV's reign. Is it any wonder that after another reign, during which the moral degeneracy of the court became worse, a "deluge" followed?

Or again in Russia. Those who have read *Rasputin, the Holy Devil*, with the picture it gives of the triviality and corruption of the

court in Czarist Russia, the callous indifference of those in authority to the sufferings of the peasants, and the reactionary attitude of the Church, perhaps lay the book down with the feeling, "If I had lived in Russia, I should probably be anti-religious and pro-Communist myself!" It is not hard to understand the terrible retribution that has come on Church and State alike in the land of the Czars: it is simply the judgment of God!

Now for China! For fifteen years the industrious and patient people of that ancient land have suffered to an unbelievable degree. Through the years there has been almost unending fighting back and forth across the fields of the farmers, their crops have been destroyed, and they themselves often impressed in an unwilling military service. I recall a poor, halfgrown coolie in our Wuchang hospital, with a horrible wound, who had been grabbed as he walked the street, and sent up to the front lines with a heavy load of ammunition. Ruthless taxation, steadily depreciating currency, waning business and declining trade, drought, flood, pestilence, and earthquake (in Kansu province thousands perished when the "mountains walked")—wave after wave of calamity has swept over the peaceful, plodding Chinese farmer and laborer until he has been reduced to absolute desperation. Millions in certain provinces have actually starved to death within the past ten years, millions of others are even now trying to exist on the roots and bark of trees, millions of others, slightly better off have, nevertheless, been undernourished for years. They see nothing ahead but the direct struggle for existence.

Then to these millions of oppressed and depressed farmers and laborers, some of whom have already turned bandit, come men, perhaps educated men, who say, "The government officials have robbed you, the landlords have cheated you, the gentry and rich merchants have exploited you! Go kill them off, and take what they have stolen from you! Set up a government of farmers and workers, and forward world revolution!" Does it seem a strange thing under existing conditions in China that these propagandists should find a ready hearing among the many simple folk who are ground under a pitiless poverty?

Dr. Sun and other Chinese leaders have said that Communism would never succeed in China, that it is not suited to the national temper and traditional social organization. However that may be, one sometimes fears today that the wish is father to the thought, for Communism is actually spreading like a prairie fire in the land of Han. Personally, it has seemed to me for some years that there are in China certain conditions that make it a most fertile field for the spread of radicalism. There are: (1) *Corruption in government.* Squeeze, illegal taxes, and brutal disregard for the fundamental rights of the people have been common. (2) *Illiteracy.* Three-fourths of the population can neither read nor write, which means that many simple-minded folk, who cannot form thoughtful judgments of their own, may be the more easily swayed by the oratory of the agitator. (3) *Fearful poverty.* We talk in America of the suffering due to unemployment,

but we are a long way yet from eating the roots of trees, and selling our children as the only way to rescue them and ourselves from starvation. The Chinese are by no means blood-thirsty, but thousands and thousands of them today are absolutely desperate, and a desperate man is dangerous anywhere in the world.

Perhaps I cannot bring this fragmentary statement to a close better than by quoting from a cable sent from Shanghai to the New York *Times* on August 3d: "Red Russia had planted her Communistic tenets. Today, those seeds planted deep within the minds of the discontented, poverty-stricken, tax-ridden Chinese peasants are bearing fruit. Ignorant and devoid of all hope, in despair they are turning to Communism, desperately and blindly trying to better their lot. China's Reds are rising and Communism in China today is probably stronger than at any time since Adolf Joffe and Dr. Sun Yat Sen achieved their now historic *entente cordiale* here within the foreign-controlled International Settlement at Shanghai."—*The Living Church.*

Anglo-Catholicism

Its Recent Past — Its Future

This article has been contributed to "The Chronicle" by an Anglo-Catholic layman. One who has been associated with this movement within The Protestant Episcopal Church for many years and has personally known many of its leaders and noted its activities particularly in the Eastern diocese of this Church.

We publish this story for the benefit of our readers, some of whom may not realize to what extremes aggressive leaders are carrying this movement. It carries with it suggestions of what may be expected at the journey's end. In face of such evidence how can Bishops, leader, clerical and lay, be indifferent? How much longer can such divisive and destructive practices and teachings be allowed without destroying completely not only the peace but also the integrity of The Protestant Episcopal Church?—*The Editor.*

The resignation of the rector of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York, his submission, re-baptism, re-confirmation and avowed intention of taking orders in the Roman Catholic Church, was news of first-rate importance not only for metropolitan newspapers, but, indeed, in practically every newspaper in any city of considerable size in the country. Because the Church of St. Mary the Virgin has long been the most prominent as well as the largest of the parishes in the Anglo-Catholic group, this resignation has been the cause of much speculation regarding the future of Anglo-Catholicism in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

The editor of *The Chronicle*, in a press statement, is reported as saying that the Anglo-Catholic movement in this country has reached its peak and is now declining. And declining rapidly. There are, of course, several reasons why this statement may appear to be true, just as there are several which would make it appear false. As a modern Anglo-Catholic, however, I think the editor of *The Chronicle*

is speaking the truth. As far as I can see, the Anglo-Catholic movement will certainly make no progress unless it frees itself from those extreme members of its groups which, at least for the past few years, have been leading all the others of the group willynilly. These extremists, a really quite small but extraordinarily noisy lot of young clergy, have been leading the whole Anglo-Catholic movement just where they pleased. If the moderate Anglo-Catholics—perhaps we should call them by the old term, "high churchmen"—will throw off this yoke, there may be a chance that the Anglo-Catholic movement will not die. But, continued leadership by the extreme group cannot result in anything but utter failure and death for Anglo-Catholicism.

The beginnings of the Anglo-Catholic movement in the Protestant Episcopal Church were characterized by a deep spirituality and humility on the part of its leaders. Their aim was certainly not to imitate the Church of Rome, as the present leaders of the movement seem to think is the chief aim of the movement. Their aim was to deepen the spiritual life of the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church by stressing the quiet, spiritual, and loveliness of the service of the Holy Communion; by stressing the blessings which meditation and quiet days would bring to souls overburdened by the cares of this busy life; by stressing the fact that a certain decent amount of symbolism and beauty is an aid to the aesthetic needs of worshipping men and women. In short, the aim of the founders and early leaders of the Anglo-Catholic movement was a spiritual aim. Ritual was a secondary thing, and to be used only insofar as it tended to set forth and impress the spiritual truths for which it stood. The movement desired no glaring publicity, nor did it achieve it. It was content to work quietly in the hearts of men and women who allied themselves with it. As such, it did an invaluable service to the Protestant Episcopal Church. It restored once again the service of the Holy Communion, and made that service appealing in its own beauty and glory. It made the regular services of the church dignified and reverent without being ornate or imitative of the Roman Church. It founded communities for men and women, devoted souls whose lives were spent, not in the propagation of foreign doctrines, but in the care of orphaned children, the sick poor, and old and destitute men and women. For these things the Protestant Episcopal Church must remember the early high churchmen with gratitude. But their spirit has died with their mortal bodies, and today an altogether different spirit infuses the Anglo-Catholic movement, and will, I fear, destroy it.

The spirit of the present day Anglo-Catholicism is Roman. It is so Roman that it often forgets to be Catholic. The leaders of the Anglo-Catholic movement have slowly introduced Roman services and customs into the Protestant Episcopal parishes over which they have charge, so that it is now sometimes quite difficult to recognise a High Mass in an Anglo-Catholic service from a High Mass in a Roman service. Indeed, the story is not infrequently told that Roman Catholics often wander into the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York, and remain ignorant of the fact that they are not in one of their own

churches until they suddenly discover something that shows them their mistake. And practically every Sunday morning at the same parish in the middle of High Mass, some one is seen to suddenly leave the church and go away—only another Roman Catholic who has made a mistake. Not once, but many times, have I been asked, "Is this a Catholic church?" by some visitor, and, knowing very well what the question meant, I have had to reply, "This is an Episcopal Church." These innovations have been slowly introduced, but lately they seem to have been increasingly multiplied, as if one parish vied with another in such introductions. I can well remember when the Rosary was first publicly recited in a certain Protestant Episcopal Church in New York, and how the clergy and laity of that parish rejoiced in that they had gone a step farther than any other parish in the city, thereby proving their Catholicity, as they supposed! And I can further remember how the parishioners of St. A chided the parishioners of St. B because the latter had a rector who hesitated for a long time before he introduced Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, while St. A had had that service regularly for some years. But St. B got even with St. A not many years afterwards by installing a statue of the Sacred Heart with nice little red and white votive lights beneath it (and a coin box and a sign reading "10c") fully half a year before St. A could procure such a statue. St. A, however, soon laughed that off, with the retort that they had installed not only a statue of the Sacred Heart, but also one of the Blessed Virgin, and another of their patron saint. And so it goes: one parish runs a race with another to see who will get the latest importation from Rome, and whoever does is immediately puffed up with pride and fancies his parish "more Catholic" than some other parish which has not yet been advanced enough to have that particular practice.

At the present time the leader of all the Anglo-Catholic parishes is that of St. Ignatius, New York. A small parish list in a small parish building, the congregation is moderately wealthy and somewhat exotic. What do we find in this parish? We find Low Masses and High Masses, celebrated with all the unction and precision of a Roman Mass. We find Masses votive to this and that, just as the Roman Church has. We find the *Gloria in Excellsis* sung at the beginning of the Mass, as the Roman rite has it, rather than at the end of the service, as the Anglican rite prescribes. We find the clergy kissing one another's birettas and finger tips and making all sorts of profound bows to one another as well as to any statue which they may chance to pass in going to and from the altar. We find certain portions of the service not only mutilated, but what is even worse, entirely omitted. The Invitation, the Confession, and the Absolution, for example, are quite forgotten at High Mass, and the congregations are not encouraged—nay, not even permitted—to make their communions at the High Mass. Just what would happen were a stray Protestant Episcopalian to present himself at the altar rail at the proper time at High Mass, is not for me to hazard. I fear he would be made to feel very uncomfortable. Candidates for confirmation are not admitted until they

have made their confession, and the so-called "Sacrament of Confirmation" is administered not merely by the laying on of hands, as the Book of Common prayer describes, but also by the marking of the cross upon the candidates forehead by the bishop's finger dipped in holy oil, gotten, no doubt, from some Anglo-Catholic bishop in the wild west, who follows the Roman custom of consecrating holy oil on Maundy Thursday. This statement, however, is a mere guess and may not be at all necessary or true, as I am reliably informed that even so decent a Churchman as the Bishop of Long Island consecrated holy oil in the Garden City Cathedral last Maundy Thursday. On certain festive days, in this parish, the consecrated wafer is placed in a golden monstrance, and carried by a priest, gorgeously arrayed, beneath a velvet canopy borne by four altar boys, about the church, filled with incense, before which canopy little children walk, casting rose petals, and about which a congregation kneels and prays to God, truly and verily present in that wafer in the golden monstrance. And, after Evensong, on Sunday afternoons, the consecrated wafer is placed in the golden monstrance, censed and prayed to; and finally held aloft over the people by the officiating clergyman, and the sign of the cross made in blessing—Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, as it is called. St. Ignatius' Church is not unique in having these services and ceremonies. There are other Protestant Episcopal parishes in New York where they can also be found. St. Ignatius', however, can still rejoice that it is the only Protestant Episcopal parish where the Holy Hour is regularly observed, on the first Friday of each month, as the Roman Church commands. This service, held in the evening, is another example of sacramental worship which the extreme Anglo-Catholics have forced upon the Protestant Episcopal Church, a service about as foreign to this church as could possibly be imagined. At it, the kneeling congregation again has before it, on the altar, the consecrated wafer in the golden monstrance. Incense is thrown at the sacrament frequently, and those in the sanctuary bow down profoundly many times. Hymns to the sacrament are sung, and litanies to the saints are said, and the Rosary recited. At the end the sacrament is again used to bless the people. Masses in memory of the dead are said and sung, doubtless upon the receipts of a fee. At the Church of St. Mary the Virgin it is well known that upon the payment of twenty-five dollars anyone can enroll a beloved dead in the chantry book, and a Mass for that person will be said four times during the year. In short the Roman doctrine of Purgatory is taught freely.

This, then, is the Anglo-Catholic movement at the present time. Is it any wonder that the rector of St. Mary the Virgin got tired of pretending to be a Catholic? Is it any wonder that he wanted to go over to that communion which is more Roman than it is Catholic? I think not. The wonder is that a few remain in the Protestant Episcopal Church at all. And the reason why they remain is certainly no credit to themselves.

The editor of *The Chronicle* and I do not wholly agree on this question of Anglo-Catholicism, but we do agree that it has gone too far.

No movement so daringly imitative of the modern Roman Catholic Church can continue to flourish in the Protestant Episcopal Church. There has got to be a stop somewhere, and unless that stop comes mighty soon there is going to be a grand smash. The whole spirit of Anglo-Catholicism as it appears today, is foreign and wholly alien to the spirit of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The Anglo-Catholic clergy do not realise that the Anglo-Catholic laity are tired of imitations imported from Rome. They do not seem to realize that a church is not made up of clergy, but of laity, and that once the laity are antagonised and aroused, there is no telling what may happen. The Anglo-Catholic clergy would do well to take counsel with the laity. If they should do this they would soon find out that much upon which they place great store is considered as so much twa-twa by the laity. All this ornate ritual, this kissing, this bowing, this mutilating of the services of the church, this constant borrowing of Roman services and saints and relics of mediaevalism, is not really valued by the Anglo-Catholic laity. What the Anglo-Catholic laity want is a decent amount of ceremonial which will set forth the sublime beauty of the services which are contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and a virile Catholicism without a dash of sham Romanism. If the Anglo-Catholic movement is destroyed, the clergy will have only themselves to thank. They cannot blame anyone else. I hope it will not be destroyed, for it has meant much to me and to many of my associates. But if it is to remain of a pseudo-Roman nature I hope it will be purged from the Protestant Episcopal church, and the sooner the better, for the church can certainly not do the work of the spirit while it is so heavily overburdened with the things of the flesh.

An Anglo-Catholic Layman in *The Chronicle.*

Book Review

NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*
(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)

Behold the Man. A picture in four aspects, by *Friedr. Rittelmeyer*, Ph.D. Translated from the German by Geo. Bennet Hatfield and Erich Hofacker. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1929. According to the second edition, 1920. 167 pages.

Dr. Rittelmeyer is an eminent pulpit orator, an independent theological thinker, and an attractive personality. The American public has hitherto not been familiar with him. This was partly due to the war, and partly, we imagine, to his intellectuality, which, in style and viewpoint, removes him from the ordinary reader and his interests. So it comes that he only now is introduced to the American church when the four lectures of this little book are almost forgotten in his own country. It would have been wise if along with this translation, personal notes had been given telling us something of the writer's life and position. Nothing is said on this subject, and so the reader is compelled to form his view of Rittelmeyer's theology and treatment entirely from these pages.

Rittelmeyer is convinced that what he has to say is a real contribution to a new appreciation of Jesus. He has given 20 years to this study, and he thinks that he has arrived at a well balanced conception of what Jesus was and is. He treats of the Lord in four chapters, speaking of his life, his personality, his message, and his significance for our time. The life of Jesus is portrayed for us in a highly original way. It ends with the crucifixion and it would be easy—and perhaps natural—to conclude from this that his evaluation of Jesus is not the conventional one. He sees in Jesus chiefly the great example, his sublime trust in God and his love for man. "The unique glory is the perfect fusion of man and commission, so luminously presented to us. The tasks which go with the commission are fulfilled without friction and the gift possessed by the man completely fulfill themselves in the work of executing his commission."

His miracles are a stumbling block to the modern man, but while some are legendary the author tries to save for the great bulk of them, if not actual reality, at least significant meaning and ideal value.

We live in a different world, we have a different theology, we may not believe in a duality of nature or in an incarnation as interpreted by the orthodox. Our Christ is an undogmatic Christ. Still the modern world needs Christ, his faith in God, his perfect character, his life of fullest consecration, his impersonation of God. "Jesus of all men was the only one who has taken God altogether seriously.

Man is to take God seriously with his entire nature and life—this is the final and deepest meaning of his message, just as it was the final and deepest content of his own life."

Much in the world of ideas has changed since the time of our forefathers. We have incorporated Spinoza into our thinking. The limits of the human mind have been delineated by Kant. We have given Goethe a large place. Newton and Darwin are our guides in the universe and in the history of man. Copernicus and Kepler have taught us the order and vastness of the heavenly world.

"Still we can't get along without Jesus. Freely and royally we may take from him what we can and receive from him yet to-day, as we can obtain them from no other source—renewal of life for ourselves, fulfillment of our ideals for our world, and ultimate union with God." Reviewer can't say that he is perfectly convinced he is treating Rittelmeyer justly when classifying him with the German idealists, with those who claim to get equal inspiration from philosophy and poetry as from the gospel. But in spite of Rittelmeyer's learning, originality and eloquent pleading—the gospel of the apostles and the faith of the Reformers were different in essence and emphasis from the picture of Jesus in these pages, beautiful though the author makes it and nice though it would be to establish a pleasing harmony between Jesus on one side and the classic thinkers on the other.

The Holy Spirit in the Life and Teaching of Jesus and the Early Christian Church. A Biblical study by P. Kluepfel. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O., 1930. 145 pages, $1.50.

It is not surprising that an unusual number of books on the Holy Spirit appear on the book market at this time. The 1900th anniversary of the coming down of the Spirit which we have observed this year explains it. Even the Lutherans who, in part, have ignored this anniversary seem to pay tribute, unwillingly, to the prevailing tendency. So it happens that we are giving space, in this issue, to the discussion of two books on the Spirit, published by a Lutheran Book Concern.

The author of this first one gives expression to the fact that hardly any doctrine is so much neglected in the teaching of the church as that about the Holy Spirit. This is understandable enough. The first article of the faith—of the creation—gives answer to the natural query of the human mind about the origin of the world and man. In the second, treating of the redemption, we see a human being at least, Jesus Christ, who led a human life. But coming to the third, we have nothing tangible, just a mysterious power, or person, doing mysterious things.

Still, the writer goes on, although veiled in mystery, the person and the function of the Holy Spirit is so important in the life of Jesus and in the early Christian Church, that we cannot afford to

ignore him. If he founded the Church, if he enabled the disciples to continue the work of the Master, he must do the same to-day.

The Lutheran Church, he thinks, has the special task of being faithful in the discharge of his duty. The Calvinistic churches have allowed the modernistic spirit to rob them of much of their biblical heritage. The Lutherans, in this country, must rally to the defence of every biblical truth, and nothing can be more important than to extend their loyalty to the much neglected field of the third article. In the Calvinistic and Puritan churches—if the spirit is not simply interpreted in an ethical sense, meaning the "way of life"—his manifestation is seen in an—often cheap—emotionalism, in revivalism, its methods and effects. Over against that, the Lutheran Church, following its biblical bent, must delve into the scriptures. Here is a rich field of spiritual ore and mining in it will have its great reward.

The writer now proceeds to bring some of this hidden material to light. He begins with the Holy Spirit in the life of Jesus, from his conception to his resurrection. Then in his teaching, in the synoptic gospels, and, especially in John. After giving a separate chapter to the discussion of Pentecost, he deals, in the second part, with the Spirit in the early Christian Church (in their worship, officers, missions), and with the Holy Spirit in the individual Christian (regeneration, fruits, "additional graces," sins against the Holy Spirit).

He quotes from the literature on the subject as found in the Roman, Anglican, Fundamentalist and Lutheran churches. All these authorities emphasize the need of the Spirit on the part of the Church, and the almost universal neglect of the due emphasis upon this need.

As far as we can see we agree with the author in most respects. He has shed light on nearly all pertinent passages and so performed a useful work. We believe with him, that "the true hope of the church lies in the life-giving regenerating power of the divine Spirit, and in the promise that the Word of God does not return to him void, but prospers in the things whereto he sends it."

The Hidden Life, or the Work of the Holy Spirit, by *L. H. Schuh, D.D.* The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O., 1930. 201 pages, $1.50.

One needs only to read the first chapter of this book to see that the previous book on the Holy Spirit is based on this one, by Dr. Schuh. The remarks on the three articles, for instance, are almost literally quoted from what Dr. Schuh says in his volume. Dr. Schuh is a well known preacher and author of the Lutheran church. He writes a plain style and it may be said of him as it was said of the Lord, "The common people hear—or read—him gladly." He is a master of his subject and his pulpit work has taught him so to express his thoughts that the ordinary people, who compose most of our membership, understand him without too great an effort.

He deals with the enlightening and sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit whereby he brings men into fellowship with their divine Saviour

and so nourishes and maintains their inner, or "hidden" life. In 14 chapters he distributes what he has to say on this all-important subject. His titles are such as these: Light in the Lord; Renovation; Kept by the Power of God; the Unending Conflict; God the Father, the Perfect Pattern; Are You a Child of God?; The Joy of the Christian Life; My Church First. In treating of these various phases of the Spirit's work, there is hardly a saying of the Lord or his apostles that he does not bring under tribute.

In his first chapter he emphasizes very strongly that the Holy Spirit is not simply an influence emanating from the father, but a personality. He makes it very clear from scripture passages that only such a conception can do justice to the biblical teaching about the Spirit. The Spirit is in and with the Christian by what the church calls a mystical union. It may be impossible satisfactorily to explain either the distinction of the three persons in the Trinity or the Spirit's union with the believer. Theologians know how again and again the former has been tried. Recall e. g. the highly philosophical attempts of Dr. Frank, the one time Erlanger scholar, along this line. He succeeded in satisfying himself and perhaps, some of the admirers of his intellectual genius: but he did not make the mystery of the Trinity any clearer. Nevertheless, the Trinitarian faith was an essential part of the original Christian heritage, and all Unitarians or modernistic denials cannot change the fact that the faith with which the church conquered the world was the faith in the Father, Son and Spirit, from early Christian times expounded and laid down in the baptismal formula. "Kept by the Power of God," the 5th chapter, makes it a comforting assurance that God has provided for the *upkeep* of our spiritual life. There are enemies in abundance and our own power is small, but God by the means of grace and the light of the Spirit on them keeps his believers alive.

The last chapter is entitled, "My church first." Here he uses "the Kingdom of God" and the Church almost interchangeably. He knows well that these expressions do not cover the same ground entirely, but he says, for practical purposes they do. This somewhat narrow use of the word, "Kingdom of God," enables him to make a strong plea for church loyalty. We cannot follow him here altogether; nor can we, perhaps, in some other points where the author's Lutheranism finds full expression. Nevertheless, the book is a wholly commendable exposition of a great scriptural truth. It is written in a reverent spirit and is an excellent spiritual fare for this year of 1930, the 1900th anniversary of the first Pentecost and the shedding abroad of the Spirit in the early Christian Church.

Outstanding Women of the Bible, by *L. Price.* The Lutheran Book Concern, 1930. 291 pages, $2.00.

Contains 18 portrayals of Old Testament and a like number of New Testament women. The sketches were originally made in German by R. C. U. Lenski. W. U. Price thought so well of them that

he reproduced most of them in English for the women of his congregation in Detroit. This reproduction is now completed by his son, Lawrence Price, and is offered to the women of the church in this book.

Many books on bible characters have been written; also on the women of the bible in particular, for instance, by Julius Kerwer, a friend of the reviewer. But seldom has the list been so comprehensive as in this volume, including e. g. Eve, the wife of the first man; Leah, Jacob's first wife; Jephtha's daughter; the witch of Endor (!); the queen of Arabia; Athalia. And in the New Testament, besides the usual number, Sapphira; Lois and Eunice; Salome.

In many cases the author had to work on slender material. In such instances he elaborates on the text and time in which the particular woman is mentioned.

His standpoint is, as may be expected, wholly uncritical. Every statement in the Bible text is sacrosanct and to be literally understood. For instance, in speaking of Eve, the rib story is treated and explained as the account of an actual and very significant fact. Such a position, of course, seems antiquated and wholly untenable to us. However, it would be unfair, for that reason to lay the book aside. The portrayal of the bible characters itself is very faithfully done. Every scrap of information is skilfully used and so a book has been completed that for use in ladies aid gatherings, for literary work of committees, and for private reading would serve a meritorious purpose. There is a great deal of information on the subject in the volume and it is given in clear and interesting fashion.

The Atonement and the Social Process, by *Shailer Mathews*, Dean of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. The Macmillan Company, 1930. 212 pages.

H. R. Niebuhr in his recent book, "The Social Causes of Denominationalism," has sought to show that the origins of Christian denominations are more to be found in economic status and social organizations than in theological distinctions. Now, in the book before us, Dean Shailer Mathews moves in a similar sphere. According to him the chief teachings of the Christian religion were evolved from projecting the conceptions of human society into man's relation to God. Man was a member of a certain human organization, say, a citizen in a republic, or a subject in an empire. This empire had its head in an emperor, whose will was the supreme law of the land. To placate his anger, to have his protection, was the chief object of his subjects, whether they be high or low. When thinking of the deity and man's relation to his God, the political organization in which the individual found himself, furnished the pattern on which his ideas about the divine king were shaped. Dr. Mathews proceeds to point out in his latest volume (the 19th of this prolific writer) how this theory can be applied to the doctrine of the Atonement. This doctrine, he rightly says, is one of the most fundamental in the Christian system. The death of Jesus

cannot be considered like that of other great leaders, e. g. of Socrates. It is not only the death of a martyr who dies for his faith, thereby manifesting the martyr's complete identification with his faith. The death of Jesus is supposed to have altered man's relation to God. By it, as Paul says, God reconciled the world to himself. God forgave man for Christ's sake. The new covenant relation between God and man are based on the death of Christ as an all-sufficient sacrifice. Such importance has been ascribed to Jesus' death through all the periods of Christian history. The cross of Christ has always been the most adequate symbol of the Christian faith.

This evaluation of the cross is firmly lodged in the teachings of the New Testament. Jesus himself is reported as saying that he would give his life as a ransom for many. The doctrine of the cross was elaborated by the apostles, especially by Paul. The biblical writers claim to have received their interpretation of the cross from Christ, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; in other words, by revelation. Human wisdom would never have produced such a gospel, says Paul, it was a direct gift from above. Jew and Gentile were hostile to it, but the faith awakened in receptive souls by God in Christ conquered the world of unbelief and hatred and created the Christian church.

It comes then with a shock rather that a dean of a school of divinity here takes up the ancient beliefs of the Christian church about the death of Christ and rejects them all. According to him all the theories of the atonement have a natural and historical origin. The Christian lived in a world where the emperor was the fountainhead of all lawful possessions and his will was supreme. How else could he formulate his religious conceptions than after the pattern of the political commonwealth in which he lived? Under the compelling influence of the situation he pictured God as the divine sovereign to whom everything and everybody is in subjection. Sinful man is concerning his relation to God in the same place where the subject who has violated a law of the earthly king, is in relation to his sovereign. The king may forgive if his forgiveness is sought in reverent and satisfactory manner. Just so will the heavenly potentate forgive the repentant sinner if approached in adequate fashion. All the theories of the atonement, says Dr. Mathews, owe their character to this earthly and mundane prototype. They attempt to rationalize, to make reasonable faith in God and his forgiveness. God is willing to forgive—even as the earthly king is willing—but to make his forgiveness possible, to make it moral, his majesty has to be satisfied. He requires a substitute from whom justice can exact full payment; after that mercy, forgiveness, reconciliation can have full sway. Mathews examines the theories of the atonement after this principle historically, from Old Testament times down to Paul, Augustine, Anselm and the Reformation era and finds that they are all built on the same pattern.

We live in a different world, he says, not in a world ruled over by a divine autocrat, but a world of law. This modern world is not held in bondage by the fear of a God who condemns the guilty sinner to hell fire. There are indeed stern laws under which we live,

and he who does not adjust himself to their workings must bear the consequences. But we call these consequences sufferings, not punishment. We don't need a divine substitute, or an all-sufficient sacrifice. We need to study and to know more and more the world in which we live and to cooperate with the elements that make for progress in it.

In the last chapters the author, after demolishing the beliefs of the past, aims to show what a modern view of the atonement would be. There are certainly abiding values in the story of the cross; what are they? Jesus in his whole life and work was always sustained by the faith in God as a father. To express this in modern terms, he believed there was a beneficent purpose in the cosmic process, that man in trying to cooperate with this drift of the universe would be victorious in the end even if his life would seem a failure temporarily. The supreme issue to-day is the question, Was Jesus correct in such a belief? There are many who deny such purpose, they deny e. g. that the universe or the physical order has any regard for personal values. Not so the writer. He holds that "human life is conditioned by a relationship to an eternally creative environment in the midst of which are continuing forces that have produced personality and with which relations can and must be set up which advance personality. To such elements of the environment activity which demand appropriation on the plane of personality and which can be seen in the intelligibility of all nature, we give the name God. He is the "You" of the cosmic process."

In so saying Dr. Matthews does not personify the universe. Furthermore, he knows that this modern Christianity is altogether different from the biblical and orthodox Christianity. A great many beliefs and conceptions considered vital in this old Christianity have to go. The whole pattern used by the old theology to explain human relations with the deity has lost its efficiency. What unites the modern Christian to the old is his loyalty to Jesus and his church. Jesus "showed in his death that by appropriating the influence of God and by the practice of love one can rise superior to temptations of all sorts and life can be made superior to death."

We do not think that the old and this new faith will ever mingle. Loyalty to Jesus, the author says, will be the uniting bond. This means, perhaps, that old and new want to be loyal to Jesus' ethical program and to the noble ideal of his life of unselfish love. But the whole life of Jesus was based on his God-consciousness. The will of the "father" was his daily food and the presence of the father his abiding strength. Communion with the father was the secret of his life. If it is claimed even that this whole "pattern" has lost its efficiency, that we can only speak of "personality-evolving elements in our environment," how can we be loyal to the faith of Jesus? How can he be our leader who lived in the thought-forms of an unscientific age, 2000 years before ours?

The author's modern Christianity can never be the faith of mankind in general. It may have a certain appeal to the scholar, the scientist; it is altogether a product of the study and the laboratory.

It offers us a religion without revelation (Huxley). Such a religion has often been in the market, but it was not the religion of Jesus Christ and his apostles, nor of the great leaders of the church. Dr. Mathews says, "Jesus in his death acted on the assumption that there was good will and reason in the cosmic process: that is his revelation to us." Paul—also speaking of the atonement—says: "If God gave us his own Son, will he not with him freely give us all things?" which interpretation is more correct and which is more sustaining, that of Paul or that of Mathews?

The Blue Flame, by *F. W. Boreham.* The Abbingdon Press, 1930. 288 pages, $1.75.

This is Mr. Boreham's new book for the year, the 25th of his productions. The people of an eastern tribe, he tells us, believe that on a certain day unseen spirits join them in their revels; and they say that, when night comes on, a blue flame hovers over any spot at which treasure has been buried. "In the course of life's pilgrimage," says Mr. Boreham to this, "I fancy I have sometimes seen the *blue flame* burning; and I have gathered into these chapters some of the spoil to which its azure glow has led me." This explains the title of the book. His manner by this time is too well known to be described in detail. He starts from a commonplace incident, or a strange term, or an ordinary experience and draws from them, in the most natural way and apparently with the greatest ease, lessons on life that are just as true and helpful as they are delightfully told. For instance, there is an essay in the book on Peter in the garden of Gethsemane. Peter drew the sword and cut off the servant's ear. Christ told him to put up the sword in its sheath, and reminded him that legions of angels stood ready to help his master if he had wanted them. So Peter's sword was not needed. Peter had forgotten the angels! The chapter, therefore, has the title "On Forgetting the Angels," and the author proceeds to show that all great things in life have been done by the men who relied on the invisible forces and not by those who had recourse only to the things of the material world.

It would be hard to find a man so well at home in the world of literature and in the world of men, as Boreham is, with a brain as fertile in invention and a hand as light in giving shape to his stories and reflections. We imagine that this new book will find as ready an acceptance as its numerous predecessors.

How to Understand the Gospels, by *Anthony C. Deane, M.A.,* Vicar of All Saints and Hon. Canon of Worchester Cathedral. Hodder and Stoughton, London. 222 pages.

A very pleasing volume on introductory questions concerning the four gospels. It is written for the general educated reader. The intricate detail which fills the pages of the ordinary commentary on such questions is omitted and the author gives instead chiefly the results of the critical study expended on the first four books of the New Testament, for many years and in different lands. The aim is

always to use these results in order to make the gospel more intelligible. It is, of course, understood that the literal inspiration theory would make it impossible to explain the many resemblances as well as the divergencies found in these gospel narratives. At the same time the author is very far from the position of some critics who leave the impression in us that we really know very little for sure on the life and teachings of Jesus (e. g. Bultmann). The writer is rather convinced—and strengthens that conviction in his readers—that the main substance of the Saviour's history and message remains unshaken.

He says, the four gospels emerge from the severest critical tests ever applied to any literature, as the supreme treasure of the bible. The skill with which the disciples performed their task of delineating the greatest character that ever lived is amazing. The brevity of their account, its reticences and its restraint are wonderful. Their portraiture of Jesus Christ is their extreme feat. If you consider the difficulty of the undertaking and the faults the writers might have committed—but avoided—then their success seems without parallel in all literature.

The author proceeds now to his task, to answer the questions that naturally arise about the authors, their mutual dependence, the times, different purposes, relation of the church to the gospels; the early Judaism, the influence of Paul, the necessity of preserving the gospel when the first generation of witnesses had passed away, etc.

The question of the source of the gospels the writer does not answer simply by accepting the two-document theory (Mark and Quelle), rather he maintains that Matthew and Luke used many earlier gospels or fragments of gospels.

In the individual treatment of the gospels which now follows, Mark has first place. As a rule Matthew and Luke are valued more highly by bible readers than Mark, who has no discourses at all. This author, however, has a high regard for Mark's version of the gospel. Not only does Mark establish the chronological order of the events better than any other. The careful reader will also note that Mark's narrative is by no means an artless chronicle of what happened. On the contrary, it is a vivid account of the ministry of the Lord and its effect upon the Jewish people. At first the synagogues are open to him and then opposition developes and he resorts to open-air preaching. The opposition penetrates even there and he withdraws from the crowd and gives himself to the training of the twelve more fully. The author describes one full day of the Lord's work (beginning ch. I, 21), showing the simple but effective way in which Mark handles this task. Then he takes up the other main section of the book, Mark's story of the crucifixion, and brings out the special features and impressive touches of that part. On the whole he comes to the conclusion that Mark ought to receive much more credit as a writer than he has usually been given.

Matthew's gospel the writer calls the gospel of the Messiah. It was written for the special needs of the Jews in the first century.

Was Jesus the Messiah when he died on the cross and his nation turned away from him? Written with such a purpose, it cannot be the gospel best suited to the needs of gentile readers of the twentieth century, the author claims. He also says that Matthew "altered and edited the documents he cites in order to make them accord with his ideas of fitness. Yet he would do that with a perfectly clean conscience, for he was but following the accepted practice of his time." But even if there are flaws in this gospel, the book which alone preserves for us in complete form the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer, we shall not be likely to under-rate.

The gospel of Matthew, more than any other, is filled with the parables and discourses of the Lord. Even the wonderful works he did are sometimes omitted here, in order to give a full account of his ministry of teaching. It is specially pointed out by the author that in Matthew's gospel there is a close resemblance between the Lord's teaching of the Day of Judgment and earlier apocalyptic writings. Whether we have in these passages the Lord's own words or whether Matthew drew on extrabiblical material, this according to our book is hard to make out. There are limitations to our knowledge, he says. The Jesus of history must even remain for us in some degree the Jesus of mystery, too.

The gospel of *Luke* might easily be called the most beautiful of all on account of the infancy stories, the parable of the Peraean ministry (chs. 9-18), and the narratives which exalt Jesus as the friend of sinners. Again, while Matthew presents in him the Jewish Messiah, Luke raises him to the place of world saviour. It is written for the Roman citizen, appealing to the educated classes. In Luke's second volume, the book of Acts, he shows that Christianity is not a Jewish sect, but a world religion, the Church being the institution to spread it over all the earth. The author has a great deal more to say about Luke's gospel. He takes a strong stand for the credibility of the virgin birth and the Christmas stories. But we haven't the space to go into these things more fully.

Nor will it be possible to treat of the problems of *John's* gospel, its author, its "editor," its farewell discourses (chs. 14-18), its mystical character, its prologue, its more "spiritual" character, etc. We have been rather full in our description of the characteristic features of this book. It does appeal to us to an unusual degree. The preacher will benefit from it as well as the lay reader. It would be hard to give more than the author has done, on so few pages. We dare say that the book is not only a great help to a better understanding of the gospels; it is a perfect delight to peruse its contents, presented as they are in lucid style and fascinating arrangement.

The Man Who Dared to Be God. A story of Jesus by *Rob. Norwood*, rector of St. Bartholomew's Church, New York City. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1929. 324 pages, $2.50.

We didn't like the title of this book when we first saw it announced; we don't like it any more now that we have read it. How

can a man, any man, *dare* to be God? Even Jesus would not have so dared if divinity had not been his by his very nature. What the author intended to express by it was that his divinity was acquired, was not his from the beginning, an effortless unfolding of a native gift, but the result of character development; by obedience and trust he raised himself to divine heights, achieved a character altogether unique in human history. And every son of man has the task of becoming divine since by nature and destination he is a son of God. So the author. Very likely we desire to voice disagreement, but let us come to that gradually. The story of Jesus as here presented has the humanistic approach. Jesus did not work miracles, i. e. by magic. Therefore the author left out the miraculous element altogether. Jesus performed cures, by phycho-therapy, he healed many. He even raised the dead, or people apparently dead (Jairus' daughter), but not by exercising his divine prerogative. Leaving out the miraculous element involves, or should involve the writer in difficulties. It does not, however. He has a wonderfully fertile imagination, a poetic gift which enables him to dispose of the most obvious problems with the ease of a sleight of hand performer. For instance, in the Holy Night there is an angel and a Christmas message and shepherds who receive this message and go and find the child. And later wise men come from the east and are sent to Bethlehem. Now here is a miraculous element. What does the writer do with it? "These shepherds found the stable. To them it was a holy place. They believed that all mothers are miracles of God, that any baby is a possible Messiah, since babies come to earth by the act and will of God. So they knelt before the manger and prayed for him, and for his mother and father. They prayed the baby might be the anointed one." Likewise the wise men. "They were free from the intolerance of creeds and the fettering of caste and country. These men also knelt before the baby. Perhaps they saw more than Joseph and Mary could see. . ."

The writer uses his imagination freely. He feels justified to do this for Luke did the same. "He filled the historic chinks with the gold of fancy, witnessing thereby to the validity of the imagination in writing about Jesus." Read his tales about Mary; Joseph of Nazareth; Nahor, his teacher, and Jesus himself. We know little about this life except what is recorded in the gospels. The author gives complete stories about every one. Jesus e. g. when 20 years old, decides to be a boat-builder and for that purpose goes to Capernaum where he becomes intimately acquainted with Zebedee and his family, with Peter and others, who later become his fellow-workers. These stories read well, they are built on bible material and on what is known of the times. Still the author tells them as though they were as authentic as the gospel record.

And how about Jesus and his inner development? How did he get hold of God? Answer: "He climbed up to spiritual maturity by the experiences of his boyhood and youth. He won purity by lifting up his body to the level of his soul. He claimed to be the Messiah because he believed in man's inborn divinity, his inbred godhood.

Every man is really a man of God potentially, even Caesar is a son of God. He, Jesus, was to help man to become what he was, a god. He himself was most successful in fulfilling his destiny. He dared to believe in God and consecrated himself to his service, he dared—in this sense—to be God. And his word, his teaching, was to reveal to man that he is the son of God.

Jesus originally believed in the God of his father, the God of John the Baptist, who uses force to destroy his enemies. Mary won him over to the God of gentleness and love.

The author has a strange preference for Judas Iscariot. He tells us a great deal about him, his hopes, his aspirations, his good intentions. He believed Jesus should use magic force to rout his enemies and build his Kingdom. He even finally betrays him in order to force his hand. When he sees Jesus cannot be so moved, he despairs and dies by his own hand. So we have a picture of Jesus' life, largely built on imagination. Not that we are not at times benefited by it; not that he does not make more lifelike many obscure or neglected features. But Jesus did not come chiefly to show man he is really God or god-like. He came to show him he was a sinner and had to become a son of God by being born again, by getting into the Kingdom of righteousness and grace by the road of forgiveness and faith.

None of the hard problems of the Christian faith does the author take up. There is no theology, no philosophy, no criticism in the book. Thank God for that, some would say. Still, by ruling out the miraculous element and "filling the chinks with the gold of artistic imagination" you can't provide an adequate substitute. We must, therefore, reject the attempt of the book to give a wholly natural interpretation of Jesus' life and person ("Jesus was physically the son of Joseph and Mary, spiritually the son of God") and suggest that the rector of St. Bartholomew's, in trying to fathom the depths of Jesus' personality, rely less on artistic imagination and more on the biblical record and the experience of the centuries.

Sadhu Hagenstein, a White Man Among the Brown, by *Rev. Martin P. Davis.*

It was May 30, 1921, when A. Hagenstein retired from his labors. God called the faithful servant home. In December, 1923 the reviewer had the privilege of visiting the scenes among which this simple follower of Jesus had labored. One morning the author of this sympathetic and illuminating biography called him to the verandah to introduce two representative Hindus. They had, according to their own statements, walked eight miles that morning to greet the Sahib who had come from America and to thank him and through him all those at home for sending to them 'Sadhu Hagenstein'. He was no longer among them, but his life had made impressions and he was not forgotten. Neither could any eye remain dry on that day, when after several years friends gathered about the place, where he lay, for a memorial service. That was but the natural expression of those who had labored by his side and under his supervision. It was not

a mere form, it was not our western mode of eulogizing, it was simply the heart intent upon showing gratitude once more and conveying to the representative of the Board of Foreign Missions from America, how deeply they had felt his loss. One of their very own had been taken from them. They knew what he had been to them. They were quite easily led into a deeper appreciation of his worth.

But the church at home—did it know Hagenstein. And his co-laborers on the field,—did they consciously evaluate his personality and his unusual influence? Might not this picture drawn so intimately by the pen of one, who in A. Hagenstein's latter days was for a time closely associated with him, becoming his assistant at Baloda Bazar and assuming part of the responsibility of the station Parasabhader, serve indeed to quicken the missionary zeal of the church? At the same time this life traced in some of its detailed developments may, according to the desire of the author, really aid evangelical men and women, who would have their boys become men in pointing to the possibilities, so readily applied by him. Thus it will make his example practical and the impressions that lead to such a complete dedication of self to God real.

The book, entitled 'Sadhu Hagenstein', published by the Eden Publishing Hause, St. Louis and Chicago for the Board of Foreign Missions of the Evangelical Synod of N. A. is not merely a biography, written after most careful study of all available material. It indicates insight into psychology and history, displays familiarity with conditions in the church at home and abroad, reveals understanding of the obligation and effectiveness of missionary endeavors, and last but not least, pictures objectively a life that touches so many phases of every individual's life that you cannot but benefit by reading this account. It becomes a mirror and an ideal.

Quite striking in its ingenious diversion from customary treatises in biography is the arrangement of the material. The author begins with the end and ends with the beginning and more beginnings. It will be worth the time of even a casual reader to investigate the significance of this. To the reviewer naturally the chapter entitled 'Decreasing Illiteracy' proved unusually interesting. On the one hand we have the 'Sadhu' in his frequently very simple concept of education and his remarkable devotion to the principle as such, while on the other hand we find the very simplicity conducive to developing an interest and appreciation on the part of those whose natural bent was quite toward another side. It is this unexpected reaction and extraordinary cooperation that leads one to acknowledge Hagenstein's blunt statement 'Knowledge without piety makes rascals', but it also constrains one to recognize that spirituality and ignorance are in no sense partners.

As a matter of fact the parent and the teacher, the doctor and the lawyer the rank and file as well as the acknowledged leader, the man and the woman, the youth and the elder, will find in this or that chapter, on one or another page something so rewarding, so genial and interesting, that he will have difficulty in laying aside the book before

he has finished reading it. It is not propaganda, though it clearly establishes the need of foreign missionary activity. It is purely human and therefore so gripping. But in its final illustration it again becomes documentary and deserves attention. Here author and subject become identified in a unity that explains perhaps the enthusiastic portrayal of this character as a whole and suggests, why this treatise of a comparatively so little known individual and so simple a missionary corroborates the observation of W. Phillips, as quoted opposite Chapter I:"

"How prudently most men remember themselves into nameless graves, while only now and then one or two forget themselves into immortality."

You can buy the book for one and a half dollars and you will never regret the investment.

T. Lehmann, Elmhurst.

Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher. Ausgelegt von D. C. M. Zorn. Zwickau (Sachsen). Verlag des Schriftenvereins (E. Klärner). 55 Seiten, Mk. 1.50.

Vom selben Verlag eine populäre Auslegung des ersten Thessalonicherbriefs von Pastor C. Manthey Zorn. Wir vermuten, von dem bekannten missourischen Pfarrer, der vor nicht langer Zeit verschied, und von dem die lutherische „Quartalsschrift" ein anziehendes Lebensbild darbot.

Der Sinn des Gebets von **Emanuel Hirsch.** Fragen und Antworten. Zweite neugestaltete Auflage. Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1928. 64 S. Kart. Mk. 2.50.

Kaum ein einziger Satz ist unverändert geblieben, der Umfang verdoppelt und die ganze Behandlung des Themas ist noch lebensvoller, wärmer gestaltet. — Aus Besprechungen der früheren Auflage: „Was er über erlebende und betende Frömmigkeit, über die Hemmungen des Gebets, über das Gebetsleben in Bitte und Dank und im Frieden der Gemeinschaft mit Gott sagt, endlich über den Rechtfertigungsglauben als den eigentlichsten Lebensgehalt und das Geistesgebet als den Höhepunkt des Betens, fesselt von Anfang bis zu Ende durch Wahrheit, Feinheit und Tiefe und es fesselt nicht bloß, sondern es mahnt den Leser und mehrt in ihm das Verständnis, den Ernst, die Freudigkeit des Betens." (Theol. Litbl. 1922, 12.)

Das Urchristentum im Lichte der Evangelienforschung von **Karl Knudsüs,** Dr. theol., Professor an der Universität Riga. Verlag von Ilfred Toepelmann in Gießen. 49 S., M. 1.50.

Die lange Arbeit an dem Quellenwert der Evangelien hat nicht zu einer befriedigenden Erfassung des Lebenswerks und der Person Jesu geführt. Der den Evangelien zu Grunde liegende Quellenstoff ist für die Zeichnung eines eindeutigen und mehr oder weniger vollständigen Lebensbildes Jesu unzureichend, obwohl wichtige seine Person betreffende Einzelerkenntnisse gewonnen worden sind. Dagegen läßt sich aus den Evangelien und ihren Quellen ein Spiegelbild des Glaubens und Lebens der urchristlichen Gemeinden gewinnen.

Wir erkennen nach dem Verfasser in der Entwicklung der urchristlichen Gemeinde a. eine älteste palästinensische Stufe, erreichbar hauptsächlich in Q. (Quelle = Logien) und bei Markus b. die Wendung zum gesetzesfreien und weltoffenen Heidenchristentum bei Markus und in der Sonderüberlieferung des Lukas c. eine spätere palästinensisch-syrische Stufe der kirchlichen Lehre und Verfassungsbildung bei Matthäus.

In der Ausführung seiner Anschauungen geht der Verfasser von der Ansicht aus, daß wir in den synoptischen Evangelien (Johannes wird nicht berücksichtigt) uns nicht mit Gewißheit den „ipssissima verba" Jesu mehr bemächtigen können. Lebensbild und Lehre Jesu liegt uns bloß vor zugerichtet und gedeutet für die Bedürfnisse der Gemeinde. Welche der drei Stufen dem Geist des Gründers am nächsten kommt, muß dem Urteil des Forschers überlassen werden.

Die palästinensische Urgemeinde hat in ihrem Glauben an den Menschensohn ihre ausgesprochene Sonderart. Sie setzt die irdische Person Jesu dem „Himmelsmenschen" (Daniel 7, Henoch) gleich, obwohl Jesus selbst das nicht getan hat (siehe Lukas 9, 26 und 12, 8. Man lese und staune über des Verfassers Exegese). Diese Entwicklung setzt mit den Auferstehungsgeschichten ein. Mit diesem Glauben verbanden sich eschatologisch-apokalyptische Anschauungen. „Die Erkenntnis von der Uebermalung des ursprünglichen Bildes infolge der Menschensohndogmatik der Urgemeinde mahnt uns zur Vorsicht bezüglich des endgeschichtlichen Bildes: nicht so sehr Jesus, als der Glaube der Urgemeinde tritt uns hier in seiner ausgesprochenen Eigenart entgegen.

Im Unterschied von dieser Stufe finden wir in Lukas ein Gegenwartschristentum, die Auswirkung des Heils in diesem Leben. Mit seiner Lehre vom Heiligen Geist und seinen Wirkungen spiegelt er die charakteristischen, ekstatisch-enthusiastischen Erscheinungen der heidenchristlichen Bewegung wieder.

Im Matthäus finden wir die Wendung zum Kirchentum (Petruslegende) und zur christlichen Schriftgelehrsamkeit. Zur Selbsterhaltung bedurfte die Kirche eine straffe Organisation und ein festes Lehrgepräge.

Die Charakterisierung der Matthäusstufe scheint uns von allen die am wenigsten einleuchtende. Doch ist der ganze Versuch, uns statt der Worte Jesu Anschauungen der verschiedenen Lebenskreise der Urgemeinde zu geben, u. E. total mißglückt. Verfasser meint, daß Lukas die Lehre und den Geist Jesu am glücklichsten erfaßt hat, aber auch er ist groß im „Uebermalen" des Lebensbildes Jesu wie der ersten Christenheit. Etwas Gewisses gibt es also nicht, wo bleibt denn da die „Kirche des Wortes"?

VOLUME 58. NOVEMBER 1930 NUMBER 6

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America

Motto: 1. Cor. 3, 22-23.
Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

TABLE OF CONTENTS 1930

PAGE

On Prayer, Manfred H. Haas 1
"Mystery" in the New Testament, Prof. J. Biegeleisen 9
Emancipation of Indian Girls, Rev. M. P. Davis 19
Wesen der Religion. Prof. Grützmacher 27
Seelenleitung. T. Kugler 37
Editorials 50
Christian World 57

Road of His Humanity, by F. C. Hoggarth 81
The Merger Question, by Theo. Wittlinger 87
Religious Activities of Man, by H. L. Streich 91
Pastor's Study Hour, by C. M. Bartlett 96
Jubiläum der Augustana. Von Dr. C. Schieler 101
Theologischer Akitvismus. Von Prof. Petersmann 112
Wahrheit der Religion. Von Prof. Grützmacher 117
Editorials 124
Christian World 134

Social Thinking and the Minister of Today, Rev. J. H. Horstmann, D.D. 162
The Moral Aspect of War, Rev. G. Nussmann 172
Religionsgeschichte und Christentum. Prof. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher 184
Die Augsburger Konfession II. Dr. C. Schieler 191
Die „Evangelische Synode" beleuchtet. N. N. 203
Editorials 214
The Christian World 224

Religion and Poetry, by R. Niebuhr 241
Brook Farm, by Mary Davis Haeussler 246
Neglected Imperatives, by Rev. H. J. Schick 254
Luther's Legacy, by G. A. Friz 257
Das Christentum in der Religionsgeschichte. Prof. Grützmacher 263
Oekumenische Kirchenkunde. Prof. Petersmann 269
Die Heilige Schrift. Pastor G. F. Schütze 278
Editorials 287
Christian World 294

Sidelights, H. Vieth 321
Pastor's Life and Study, C. Loos 330
The Jew, C. Chworowsky 343
Buddhismus. Prof. Grützmacher 349
Gottsuchen. T. Kugler 359
Editorials 370
The Christian World 376

Our Revolutionary Religion, H. J. Hahn 401
Origin of Life, H. J. Schick 410
The Barthian Movement, A. J. Munstermann 420
Der Mohammedanismus. Prof. Grützmacher 431
Die Apokryphen. E. Schweizer 441
Editorials 448
Christian World 455

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

v.58
1930
CBPar

Theological magazine of the Evangelical Synod of North America

v.58
1930

GTU Library
3 2400 00307 7215